

September 8, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

22225

The full value of any land, including any park land, taken for a road is just as much a part of the cost of the road as is the cost of labor, or of materials, or of engineering, or any other out-of-pocket expenses.

And the public is paying both costs, the one consciously, the other in great part without realizing it. Too many people have shared the infant innocence of Housman's poem:

The grizzly bear is huge and wild;
He has devoured the infant child,
The infant child is not aware
It has been eaten by the bear.

Therefore, I welcome Secretary Udall's recent proposal that the interstate highway between the Lincoln Memorial and the 14th Street Bridge be put wholly underground.

And I especially applaud Secretary Udall's unanswerable demonstration that the real cost of the new highway in the tunnel would be less than if it were built on the surface through Potomac Park. The Secretary's point is simply that in calculating the real cost of the new highway full account must be taken of the far greater acreage of park land which would be required by the Highway Department's proposed surface road, as well, of course, as of the value of the land now covered by existing roads which under both plans would be restored to the park.

The Highway Department argues that its surface road plan must be chosen because its construction cost is only \$40 million compared with \$58 million of construction cost for Secretary Udall's tunnelled road.

But the Highway Department's surface road would take from the park 8.1 net acres of present park land worth, according to the Secretary, \$13 million, making the real cost of the Highway Department's road \$53 million.

Secretary Udall's tunnelled road would restore to the park 9.7 acres more than the small amount of park land it would actually use. The value of this acreage restored to the park is \$17 million. So the real cost of the Secretary's tunnelled road would be reduced to \$41 million.

Secretary Udall's tunnelled road would actually cost the public \$12 million less by any reasonable standard of accounting. And it would save the park as well.

Fortunately, Secretary Udall—subject only to the approval of the National Capital Planning Commission, which has demonstrated its lively sense of the vital importance of our Capital City's parks—has full legal authority to insist on his position. He could, of course, be overruled by the President, but it is inconceivable that President Johnson, who has so admirably launched the "Beautify America" campaign, would in this crucial test fail to support his Secretary of the Interior.

Secretary Udall has pointed out that areas of Potomac Park already occupied by recent interstate highway projects for the approaches to the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge, the 14th Street Bridges and the Washington Channel Bridge total 37.3 acres, valued by the Secretary at almost \$70 million. No compensation to our city's park system has been made

for any of this land. It is none too soon to apply the principle for which I have long been contending; namely, that if park land is to be taken anywhere for highways or any other purpose, at least the dollar value of the land so taken must be fully accounted for.

But, though the hour is late, the Secretary's proposal can still save what remains of Potomac Park.

U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, in recent weeks we have all heard public assertions that U.S. policy concerning Vietnam has taken a swift and dangerous turn. Some Americans would have us believe that the course we are pursuing in that beleaguered country was born in February of this year when air strikes were initiated on a regular basis against North Vietnam.

While the pace of our response to Communist aggression has been stepped up, our commitment to respond by all necessary means is not of recent origin. It stretches back to the early 1950's when we provided military assistance to the French, who in those days were militarily engaged in Indochina.

The implications of a Communist takeover were well realized then, as they are today. In June 1953, former President Eisenhower warned those who would have us disregard the fortunes of the small nations of southeast Asia:

There is no free nation too humble to be forgotten. All of us have learned * * * that all free nations must stand together, or they shall fall separately.

President Eisenhower went on to state that to surrender Asia would mean leaving a vast portion of the population of the world to be mobilized by the forces of aggression.

In a similar vein, John Foster Dulles, then our Secretary of State, observed a month later:

The situation in Indochina today represents one of the most serious present threats to the free world.

Upon reflecting on these statements, one gets the eerie feeling that both speakers were describing the situation that prevails today—more than 12 years later. Vietnam is still a small humble nation and the threat to its freedom from Communist-sponsored insurgency continues to be the most serious immediate threat to the free world. But the important thing to remember, 12 years later, is that it is still free.

Each succeeding U.S. administration has had to answer for itself the difficult question of the worth of this freedom. All have come to the same conclusion. President Eisenhower affirmed this in the unilateral declaration of the United States following the signing of the Geneva Accords when Walter Bedell Smith, then Undersecretary of State, solemnly promised that the United States would view any renewal of aggression with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security.

A more specific U.S. commitment was made in September 1954 when South

Vietnam was included as a protocol state under the umbrella of the SEATO agreement. Consider, if you will, the wording of article IV of that treaty:

Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area * * * would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will, in that event, act to meet the common danger * * * at the request of the government concerned.

President Kennedy, 7 years later, faced the same question. He responded:

We are prepared to help the Republic of Vietnam to protect its people and to preserve its independence.

This same promise has been stated many times over by President Johnson.

And so, the American policy of commitment to South Vietnam is woven from the pledges of three Presidents. But pledges are cheap unless backed up by concrete actions.

We can all be thankful that the United States has, over the years, matched words with deeds. To have done otherwise would have destroyed our national integrity.

Between 1953 and 1961, we provided the Government of South Vietnam almost \$1.5 billion in economic aid and a comparable amount in military assistance. U.S. economic and military missions have been present in Vietnam since the days of the French. The amount of monetary assistance provided, and the number of U.S. personnel sent, have increased in response to the mounting aggression from North Vietnam.

The theme of U.S. Presidents has been: We will provide all that is required to achieve our objectives.

What, one may ask, are these objectives? In 1955, the Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs stated them succinctly:

What we want in Asia is what we want everywhere—a world made up of independent, responsible, democratic countries whose governments are devoted to the peaceful development of their own territory and to the welfare and freedom of their own people.

Almost 10 years later, Ambassador Taylor put it this way:

We are not looking for anything for ourselves. We are not attempting to gain a military foothold on the Asian continent, we do not seek to widen the war. This war was started by the Communists, and it will end when they cease their aggression. * * * Our assistance to the Republic of Vietnam has cost the lives of many Americans. One must recognize that others will be lost before this effort is completed. But these sacrifices are being made in the knowledge of the far greater sacrifices which have been made by the Vietnamese people in their struggle to preserve their independence and to resume the progress toward well-being and prosperity which has been interrupted by aggression from the North.

What the future holds, none can say, but the words of the Assistant Secretary of State in October 1953 are just as apt now as they were then when he observed, referring to the French effort in the Red River delta:

The future of the world is in the hands * * * of the infantrymen on the line * * * in the paddy fields.

Our policy of providing the support necessary to repel the aggression and

enable the Republic of Vietnam to live in peace has been consistent and just, and is still right.

AMERICAN LEGION ENDORSES OBJECTIVES OF COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, for several years, the American Legion has not taken a position on the cold war GI bill, mainly because the veterans who would benefit from this bill were ineligible for membership in this fine veterans' organization.

At the national convention of the American Legion during the last part of August of this year, the position of the American Legion changed. In their testimony before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee on September 2, 1965, on the cold war GI bill, the American Legion endorsed and pledged their support for the objectives of the cold war GI bill.

To illustrate their fine testimony, I ask unanimous consent that the statement made by John J. Corcoran, director of the National Rehabilitation Commission of the American Legion, before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, and the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY JOHN J. CORCORAN, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL REHABILITATION COMMISSION, THE AMERICAN LEGION, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON THE COLD WAR GI BILL AND RELATED PROPOSALS, SEPTEMBER 2, 1965

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for giving us this opportunity to present the views of the American Legion on the bills now before you, which would provide certain benefits and services for cold war veterans. The American Legion endorses and supports the general objectives of those bills, and we urge your early, favorable action upon them.

For several years, our organization took no position upon proposals to expand the spectrum of benefits available to cold war veterans. Although frequently not understood, the reason was, I think, a simple and logical one. It was based upon the fact that the proposals related to persons who had not had war service. The American Legion has long adhered to the policy of not actively supporting legislation which would not directly affect war veterans. Thus, completely without regard to the merits of the proposals, we declined to take a position on bills such as those now receiving your consideration.

All that has changed, Mr. Chairman. Circumstances, such as those that exist in Vietnam, now justify and, in fact, compel the American Legion to take an active part in seeking fair treatment for present members of the Armed Forces. And, again, the explanation is a simple one: we believe that the conditions which exist in certain areas of the world today are creating war veterans. Thus, we will actively support proposals aimed at benefiting those persons.

I do not find it surprising that our organization has concluded, even in the absence of a declared war, that current members of the Armed Forces are war veterans. The Korean conflict was not a declared war. On the other hand, the President of the United States, in a recent press conference, referred to the conditions in Vietnam as a war. In short, Mr. Chairman, it appears that the term "war" has taken on a new and unconventional meaning. While we hope and pray that there will never be another general war

in the conventional sense, we must not close our eyes to the combat conditions that widely prevail, the hostilities that are taking place, and the acts of warfare being committed. Nor can we ignore the fact that our servicemen are being subjected to special disciplines and special deprivations; we have assigned them to special obligations, duties, and hazards. They have earned special consideration by the Nation they serve.

In consonance with these considerations, our national executive committee, on May 6, 1965, approved the report of a special committee, the essential point of which was the conclusion that persons now serving in the Armed Forces are war veterans. In addition, our national convention, on August 26, 1965, approved resolution No. 125, which seeks an expansion of benefits for our servicemen. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit for the record a copy of resolution No. 125.

You will note that our resolution seeks additional benefits for persons who have served since August 5, 1964. That date relates to an incident which occurred in Vietnam. The Vietnamese theater was selected, rather than some other post-Korea campaign or expedition, because of the size and scope of the combat activity there. August 5, 1964, was selected on the grounds that, prior to that time, our function in Vietnam was advisory and our military operations defensive. As a result of aggressive acts of war committed against us in the Bay of Tonkin on August 5, however, the nature of U.S. military activity changed. Consistent with long-established Legion policy, we feel that, with respect to any additional benefits made available by Congress, all persons who serve after August 5, 1964, should be treated equally, regardless of place of service. We do not favor the "hot spot" concept.

You will note also, Mr. Chairman, that resolution No. 125 directs us to seek comparable benefits. That word was chosen deliberately because it was recognized that the possibility exists that we should not seek identical benefits. My staff and I have been instructed to study this matter and to recommend to the October 6, 1965, meeting of our national executive committee specifically what benefits, and in what degree, we feel ought to be extended. We returned to our office from the national convention on Monday, August 30, and we are, therefore, not yet prepared to comment. We will move ahead rapidly, Mr. Chairman, and I do hope the committee will permit us, as it always has, to offer suggestions as we crystallize our thinking.

I would like to express a personal opinion on one of the types of benefits being considered, the cold war GI bill. This readjustment benefit appears to be the most controversial and was singled out by the Veterans' Administration witness for special opposition. I cannot agree with the reasons advanced by the VA for opposing a cold war GI bill. VA testified that readjustment benefits should be limited to situations where wartime service sharply disrupted career planning and called for special Government aid to ease the transition from wartime service back to civilian life. The American Legion believes that the men who are serving in our Armed Forces have had both their career planning and their careers irreparably disrupted; they will lose years out of their lives that they will never be able to make up; they are serving under war-like conditions and, they deserve every help our Government can provide to ease their readjustment to civilian life.

The VA witness said, "we recognize that the present international situation is extremely delicate and that some of our servicemen are operating under combat conditions." It has been some time since I heard an understatement of that magnitude. It sounds like the statement of an agency

whose opposition to attempts by this committee and the Congress to improve the veterans benefits program is becoming routine. It does not sound like the statement of an agency whose mandate is to be the spokesman for veterans and whose self-assigned mission is "to exercise constructive leadership in the field of veterans affairs." National Commanders and other representatives of the American Legion have visited our Armed Forces in Guantanamo, in West Berlin, in Strategic Air Command Headquarters, and in Vietnam. They would scarcely describe the situation as "delicate," nor would they conclude that only "some" servicemen are operating under combat conditions. The Veterans' Administration seems to be out of touch with what's going on in the outside world.

I would like to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that I make no criticism of the VA personnel in the operating and program services, such as the Department of Veterans Benefits and the Department of Medicine and Surgery. Those people give every appearance of attempting to administer veterans laws in a generous and compassionate manner. In addition, in the past two decades, they have earned a reputation for innovation and creative thinking, both of which have substantially improved the veterans benefits program. My criticism is intended for those who influence and help establish national policy toward veterans; in short, the policymakers and the decisionmakers.

The witness for the Department of Defense opposed a cold war GI bill on the theory that it would induce men to leave the military service. The witness said that these men should be given assistance for education and training, but in a way which would not interfere with the mission of the Department of Defense. We believe, Mr. Chairman, that the argument that a readjustment law would induce men to leave service is speculative, and that it is questionable, in any event, whether there would be any substantial impact upon the Military Establishment. It would seem, also, that if there were an alternative plan to a cold war GI bill the Department of Defense would have found it by this time.

It is my personal conviction, Mr. Chairman, that there is sufficient justification for some kind of cold war GI bill. In this great country of ours, where our Government is trying so hard to do so much for so many, is there any group more deserving of special consideration than the members of our Armed Forces? The American Legion thinks not.

Thank you, again, for permitting me to present our views on this most important subject.

RESOLUTION No. 125

(Adopted at the 47th annual national convention of the American Legion at Portland, Oreg., Aug. 24-26, 1965)

Whereas the United States is now and has been for some time engaged in actions in various areas of the world to keep peace and preserve the freedom of friendly nations against aggression; and

Whereas American fighting men have been and are increasingly being subjected to war-time conditions, are suffering casualties and are dying in defense of freedom loving people everywhere; and

Whereas the conditions to which our servicemen are being subjected are similar to those which existed when certain rights and benefits were granted to those who served in World War II and Korea; and

Whereas the war veterans program is comprehensive, justified, and a proven program supported by the American Legion and the general public; and

Whereas on August 5, 1964, in Tonkin Bay off the coast of Vietnam aggressive acts of war were taken against U.S. warships which retaliated and since that time our country

22230

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 8, 1965

fail to produce adverse repercussions on its weaker key reserve currency partner (he would only have to ask the Fed or the Bank of England and they would soon have put him right concerning the pressure on sterling directly resulting from success of the U.S. voluntary program). Similarly Japan, which had been particularly prominent in exploitation of the Eurodollar market, could not have failed to have her troubles as soon as the formerly freely flowing U.S. dollar tap was turned off. Are the present currency and liquidity crises that now beset the world at large not to be considered as troubles of any importance whatsoever?)

(c) "Canada has not suffered at all." Why then the Atlantic acceptance default? Why the unprecedented action of the hard money-minded Governor of the Bank of Canada in desperately increasing the Canadian money supply by \$600 million (lest the whole flimsy Canadian finance "house of cards" alarmingly collapse and Canadian external insolvency nakedly revealed as a cold fact)? Yes indeed, Canada has already suffered, and despite the vaunted Russian grain deal coup still cannot succeed in closing her chronically deficitary payments gap vis-a-vis the United States. But the real problem will arrive whenever the hitherto greedily blind U.S. investor in Canada becomes belatedly face to face with this fact (to the disgruntlement of the head of the U.S. Treasury Department).

(d) "The less-developed countries are exempt from the effects of the program." (Quite true, but of what use to them when Mr. Fowler's conservative outlook on world liquidity in general serves to bar them from access to desperately needed capital of all kinds? Of what practical value such exemption, when even countries such as Japan cannot now raise in New York a miserable \$100 million of new loans vitally needed to fill the gap created by the voluntary program (and the turning off of the Eurodollar tap)? And what are now the hopes of such liquidity starved nations when Mr. Fowler hits back so fast at his "liberally" enlightened critics, and then prepares to go to his "conservative" banker soulmates in Europe in order to assure that liquidity will ever be there for the rich developed nations, but tragically debarred from the desperate "have-nots")?

(e) "Eurodollars are dollars held and loaned by foreigners . . . the withdrawal of U.S. funds from the 'pool' has been replaced from other sources" (how lightly in the latter reference to dismiss the desperate scramble that took place as a consequence of the voluntary program. Mr. Fowler evidently was not informed about this but even the lowliest practical technocrat of the international money markets considered this to be a most notable episode in financial history. And in the former reference the term "held and loaned" has a most misleading connotation. Reminiscent of the many "learned" books written on the Eurodollar subject by otherwise well-informed monetary pundits. That Eurodollars merely pass from American Bank A to American Bank B, in such process no harm whatsoever to the United States and its balance of payments. In fact someone in the Treasury Department some 4 years ago (before Mr. Merlyn Trued), in a memorandum addressed to me following a written warning sent to the Federal Reserve on the dangers to the United States of the Eurodollar market, politely inferred that I was living in a world of my own, and a wide world short position in U.S. dollars was a figment of my imagination. For the Eurodollar market if anything really served to finance U.S. trade, and certainly did nothing adversely to affect the American balance of payments. But the same people now claim credit for the voluntary program, the success of which is only due to the fact that the short-term capital outflow was of con-

siderable proportions, and the foreigners when out off from such supply would be in trouble, but not the balance-of-payments position of the United States).

But (with all due apologies to the President) is it not time that those in high office commence intelligently to "reason together," instead of continuing to wash dirty American linen before the American and foreign public? And when American exalted officials such as the very heads of the U.S. Treasury and central bank reveal to the world their unenlightened conservative philosophy how can Americans and foreigners alike possess any faith or confidence in the economy or currency of the United States. Conversely, what a profound but uplifting spirit would be engendered were such as Mr. Donald Cook and Prof. Seymour Harris the spokesmen of American power and liberally enlightened intelligence. Would the European central bankers, whom the American monetary authorities continue to cosset in search of aid and comfort of a sorrowly considered weak U.S. dollar, then look contemptuously down on American monetary amateurs, who fail to convey the overwhelming strength of the economy and currency of their country, while inviting pious foreign lectures on fiscal responsibility and balance-of-payments discipline (how shortsighted they too are, for were the United States to observe their bestests, Europe would soon be a truly broken continent). So, before more water (or rather hot air) goes over the dam let the United States proceed from peerless strength and the righteousness of its cause. As Senators HARTKE and McCARTHY so rightfully exhort let America at last demonstrate to the world bold and enlightened leadership in monetary affairs, and call for an early showdown on the issue of IMF reform and the role of gold. And as they perceptively point out, "the September meeting of the IMF Executive Board will provide the proper forum for such a call."

Respectfully,

JOHN E. SMITH,
Bank Adviser.

OUR RESPONSIBILITY IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, President Eisenhower decided in October 1954, "to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong viable state capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means." Since then three U.S. administrations have repeatedly examined and reexamined the alternatives open to this country in southeast Asia. Each re-examination has confirmed the basic necessity of the commitment we made 10 years ago, a commitment based on the conviction that the vital interests of the free world and our own country could be broadly affected by the course of events in southeast Asia.

That part of the world has great strategic significance in the forward defense of the United States. Its location across east-west air and sea lanes flanks the Indian subcontinent on one side and Australia, New Zealand, and the Philippines on the other. It dominates the gateway between the Pacific and Indian Oceans. In Communist possession, this area would present a serious threat to the security of the United States and to the entire non-Communist world.

Also, South Vietnam is a test case for the Communist strategy that was spelled out by Khrushchev in 1961 when, in a major elaboration of Communist doctrine, he dedicated communism to the provoking and encouragement of "wars

of liberation" and specifically referred to Vietnam as one such war. "It is a sacred war," he said. "We recognize such wars." The West cannot let communism succeed with this aggressive expansionism.

Finally, and most to the point, South Vietnam, with extremely limited resources in terms of education and experience, is struggling to develop a viable economy and a national identity. The Vietnamese have asked for our help. We are giving it. We do so in their interest, and we do so in our own clear self-interest.

Our goal there is simple and forthright. The United States has no designs whatever on resources or territory in that part of the world. Our national interest does not require that South Vietnam or Thailand or Laos or any other country of southeast Asia serve as a Western base or a member of the Western alliance. Our ultimate goal in southeast Asia, as in the rest of the world, is to maintain free and viable nations which can develop politically, economically and socially, and which can be responsible members of the world community.

We could, of course, abandon Asians to a Communist and Chinese expansionism by pulling out of South Vietnam and vacating our commitments there. To do so, as President Eisenhower stated in 1959, would almost certainly "set in motion a crumbling process that could, as it progressed, have grave consequences for us and for freedom. The remaining countries in southeast Asia would be menaced by a great flanking movement." As this happened, the sphere of the free world would begin to shrink. We would simply postpone, perhaps only briefly, the time when we would be forced to stand fast or forfeit the leadership of the free world and, by default, deny millions of people the opportunity to pursue their own national destinies in free societies.

The alternative followed by this administration—and its predecessors—is to draw on our rich resources, our dedication to freedom, the power of our prestige, and our military capabilities to help the people of South Vietnam defeat this aggression and build a stable, independent society. This is not going to be easy or quick. But because the conditions are difficult and the processes agonizingly slow is no reason to abandon our carefully chosen course, and choose instead to withdraw to the certainty of facing the same situation in other lands.

We are a big and great country, and today we shoulder the burdens of leading the free world. We do this not for the pride of power but because of our responsibility to the cause of human freedom that is the keystone of our way of life. Problems of war and peace, and the task of defending the course of freedom under adverse conditions perhaps far from home are an unshakeable part of that burden. Most Americans know this to be true. We cannot quit or panic because the going is tough, the cost is high, and the progress is slow. We are going to stick to our commitment, to use our power wisely and to save and extend freedom wherever and whenever we can. That is not merely the hon-

September 8, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

22229

Constitution a splendid column by Eugene Patterson, editor of the Constitution, commending Ambassador Bennett for his dedication to duty and his devotion to serving the best interests of the United States and the people of the Dominican Republic.

I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal-Constitution, Sept. 5, 1965]

TAP BENNETT: THE AMBASSADOR DESERVES A WORD

(By Eugene Patterson)

Georgia's Tap Bennett had to take some hard decisions in April.

Telephoning from the cover of his desk, while gunfire shattered pictures on his U.S. Embassy walls, Ambassador Bennett advised President Johnson to land troops in the Dominican Republic, which he did.

Instantly, Bennett found himself being fired on from another direction—from some second guessers at home who demanded to know if this intervention was necessary.

Lacking the Ambassador's information, they impugned his judgment and gave his reputation some bad handling.

They asked, how do we know there really was a Communist danger that couldn't be handled by the local progressives (or local reactionaries, depending on the question's own politics)?

If Ambassador Bennett could speak in defense himself now, 4 months later, he might suggest that the frustrating delays in reaching a final solution are proof enough in themselves of the Communist aspect of the situation.

DANGEROUS

The country clearly was out of control, neither Caamano's leftists nor Imbert's rightists were in charge, Communists were on the move as they usually are in scenes of chaos, and a lot of people were dying. There certainly is no doubt that a great many lives were saved by the U.S. intervention and that might be reason enough in itself to justify the landings.

Tap Bennett knew full well the price the United States would pay for this in lost good will among Latin Americans. But his conviction stands that the situation would have been much more dangerous had the United States not taken action.

Subsequent events have also silenced those critics who had a field day smearing Bennett as a rightist tool of the Dominican rich, bent on smashing Caamano's leftist uprising and installing Imbert in a rightwing tyranny.

Bennett had neither intention, as events have shown, and as anyone who knew the quiet, firm Georgian would have known. Imbert and Caamano have both been firmly held back from any takeover, along with the Communists, while the United States has striven to get a compromise government built around an acceptable, responsible element.

Bennett has a clear and democratic vision of what the Dominican people need and is as deeply committed to it—agricultural improvement and educational beginnings. For the United States to be placed in a purely negative posture, in a nation that has so many positive, crying needs, would seem to him the real disaster. He has stood unwaveringly with the people, and even during these months of crisis he has ordered school construction to continue.

NEEDS OUTLINED

Those who were picturing him a few months ago as a champion of the privileged

businessman at the expense of the poor Dominican—as an ambassador who mingled too much with the wealthy—could have avoided their error in their judgment of him if they had simply heard what he said to the businessmen he mingled with in Santo Domingo last December 15.

Speaking to the Santo Domingo Rotary Club, he didn't scratch any backs. He did the opposite. He outlined the needs of the country's poor, the aims of the Alliance for Progress, and then he read a firm riot act to his well-to-do friends about their own responsibilities.

"If an outworn concept of small unit production and high unit profit prevails," he said, "if individuals prefer to send their money abroad, then rapid economic expansion will be much harder to achieve."

"No one likes to pay taxes," he told the men who should pay most, "but action of this type is necessary."

And he quoted President Kennedy, pointedly relating the words to the Dominican Republic, on the need to modify social patterns "so that all, and not just a privileged few, share in the fruits of growth."

This, then, is the Ambassador who was being widely criticized short months ago as a rightist, saber-rattling Blimp. He never was, and isn't now, as events are beginning to prove of themselves.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY REFORM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, John E. Smith is a well-known and well-respected expert in the field of international finance. As the New York foreign exchange expert of one of the leading French banking groups—a group which is owned by the French Government—Mr. Smith has gained a thoroughly deserved reputation as one of the most perceptive observers and analyzers of the international monetary scene. It was, therefore, with the highest sense of honor that I received from Mr. Smith a copy of a letter which he had written to Dr. Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

In this communication, which Mr. Smith has graciously permitted me to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, he endorsed the principles and policy recommendations which my distinguished colleague from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] and I have espoused on the subject of international monetary reform and the U.S. balance of payments. Speaking as a professional student of international finance, Mr. Smith was kind enough to say:

The Hartke-McCarthy statement to the Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress contained those very words of refreshing acumen in high U.S. places, that have been long awaited by the practical technocrats of the international exchange and money markets.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Smith's letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 19, 1965.

DR. GARDNER ACKLEY,
Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers,
Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. ACKLEY: Again I hope not turning up like a bad penny, but rarely a day

passes without cause for attempt to keep the record straight as far as conduct of international economic and financial affairs is concerned. One day, highly elated to note the enlightened practical wisdom of such as Senators HARTKE and McCARTHY. The next, frustratedly cast down following exposure to Secretary Fowler's views on international monetary matters.

Indeed the Hartke-McCarthy statement to the Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress contained those very words of refreshing acumen in high U.S. places, that have been long awaited by the practical technocrats of the international exchange and money markets. Frank expression of fundamental commonsense and practical reason, so gratifyingly dissimilar from the rambling and unenlightened doubletalk to which the U.S. Congress has been so long confusingly subjected. And all the real nails were hit unerringly on the head—"mobilize the world's gold through the medium of the IMF" (drastically reformed)—"a modest controlled balance-of-payments deficit" (basically essential to the world's present liquidity needs)—"a new working medium to supplement the dollar and the pound as vehicles for trade * * * not to supplant them as international reserves" (whether the rest of the world likes it or not neither the dollar nor the pound can possibly be replaced as the vital working media of international trade and finance) * * * "gold today has become the worldwide symbol of deflation" (as well as the only chink in the American currency armour) * * * "the IMF may have to take on some banking characteristics it does not now have" (eventually and inevitably the IMF, or a freshly formed other similar body must operate as the central bank of central banks) * * * "The September meeting of the IMF Executive Board will provide the proper forum for such a call" (to international monetary sanity) * * * "the overriding problem of today—a shortage of internationally accepted means of transferring goods within the world economy" (members of the international (including American) banking establishment, please note).

This alone sufficient indeed to inspire renewed hopes of early exercise of peerless American power in the realm of international trade and finance. But sadly enough there would appear to be always a dismally looking overbore to the coin. For immediately thereafter such hopes are miserably dashed by Secretary Fowler's critique of the Hartke/McCarthy enlightened contentions. His principal points (together with pertinent rebuttals):

(a) "Any economic slowdown in the surplus countries has been caused by their own anti-inflation actions" (partly true, but what about their (and the whole world's) desperate scrambles in the Eurodollar market following the universal impact of the voluntary program? Is not every well-informed international monetary authority fully aware of the obvious fact that world liquidity since World War II has been utterly dependent on the existence of a U.S. deficit in its balance of payments? That exaggerated recourse to U.S. dollars, which constitute the deficit (instead of to their own bloated exchange reserves), has given rise to self-inflicted inflationary tendencies, which they now seek to correct).

(b) "The troubles of Britain and Japan have nothing to do with the American balance-of-payments program." (Certainly not all, but had Secretary Fowler been exposed like the practical market technocrats to the impact on these countries of the voluntary program he would have wisely refrained from expression of such a sweeping statement. He would also have been aware of the fact that the consequent resurgent strength of the dollar could not

September 8, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

22231

orable course, it is the wise and necessary one for America.

So I support President Johnson in the course of action that he has outlined. I support him soberly, recognizing that the decisions that have been reached will mean personal sacrifice for many American families. The decisions to enlarge draft calls, call up reserve units, and extend duty tours were not taken lightly. They are the product of thorough, searching study, and a full and careful weighing of alternatives. For, as the President has stated over and over again, this is not a war that we seek. In Vietnam as elsewhere we prefer the paths of peace. We have come only with reluctance to the course of action now before us. We have done so only after exploring all valid alternatives and rejecting them as incompatible with our commitment to freedom and human dignity and our interest in increasing the stability of a divided world in the atomic age.

BIG BROTHER: FDA

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, recent hearings before the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure exposed certain activities of the Food and Drug Administration to be disgraceful and completely contrary to the protective guarantees of our Constitution.

Perhaps the most shocking of these exposures involved the raiding of a premises here in the Nation's Capital.

This raid was reminiscent of a bygone era when large numbers of Federal and local law enforcement officials set upon centers of gangland activity. True to form, this recent raid was preceded by intelligence from an FDA spy planted on the premises. In authentic Hollywood style, FDA agents and marshals descended on private property while local police roped off the street and held back the crowds. Press reporters and photographers accompanied the agents while they ran through the premises, banged on doors, shouted and seized what they viewed as incriminating evidence.

Three particular aspects of this episode were especially shocking to the subcommittee. First, the incursion took place on church property. Second, the agents had no valid search warrant. Third, the particular objects sought and seized were devices used in the churches' confessional procedure.

Now I have no objection to the use of forceful tactics when the circumstances warrant them. These are necessary when bootlegging, gambling and other forms of organized vice pose a real threat.

However, it is difficult, if not impossible, to justify such offensive behavior by FDA agents on the property of the Founding Church of Scientology.

This senseless example of bureaucratic bungling is completely contrary to the letter and the spirit of the constitutional guarantees of this Nation and those of other democracies. The whole disgraceful affair is offensive to the sensibilities of all freedom loving men, wherever they might live.

At this point in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to insert copies of letters sent to me by a Canadian ministerial student. The original of one of these letters was sent to the Canadian Ambassador to the United States; the other was addressed to the U.S. Secretary of State.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCIENTOLOGY CENTRE,
Kentville, Nova Scotia, Canada, August, 5, 1965.

The SECRETARY OF STATE,
State Department of the United States of America, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The enclosed copy of my letter of protest addressed to The Canadian Ambassador to the United States, Washington, D.C., dated January 6, 1963, is self-explanatory.

It is my understanding that this case is still pending and has never been brought up for a hearing and a decision before any court.

Due to the obviously unduly long period of time which has elapsed since the described subject incident has occurred and the internationally basic principles involved, I hereby request that you take immediate action to clear up this situation by an official apology to me and all others concerned together with definite assurances that this entirely un-American and internationally unconstitutional act will not be repeated, and that my personal property; namely (1) E-Meter Serial No. 782 either be returned to me or its purchase price of \$150 (U.S.) be refunded to me. And, in the case of the meter being returned to me that all costs of repairing this instrument to restore it to its proper, original working order be borne by the U.S. Government.

Looking forward to your early reply in this matter, I am,
Sincerely,

JOHN P. WOOTE, D.C., H.S.S.

STUDENT ACADEMY OF SCIENTOLOGY,
FOUNDING CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY,
Washington, D.C., January 6, 1965.

The CANADIAN AMBASSADOR,
Canadian Embassy Chancery,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: I hereby wish to report and register the strongest protest possible against officials of the U.S. Government responsible for the following incident:

On Friday afternoon, January 4, while attending as a resident student the Academy of Scientology, Founding Church of Scientology of Washington, D.C., at the above address, my pastoral counseling session in which I was receiving counseling at the time from my auditor, was rudely interrupted by the noisy entrance of a Robert Haislip, deputy U.S. marshal, U.S. Department of Justice, and another man who had a camera in his hand, loudly announcing that they were U.S. marshals and that they were confiscating all E-Meters (the Hubbard Electrometer: an electronic device for measuring the mental state and change of state of homo sapiens; used by Scientology auditors in pastoral counseling sessions) and Ability magazines (official publication of Scientology in the Americas), and that we should stop what we were doing and give up this equipment and materials. Mr. Haislip then proceeded to take my auditor's E-Meter, gave no receipt for same and only permitted, when asked to do so, that a record of the E-Meter serial number for identification be made. Then later in the lecture hall of the Academy of Scientology, a John R. Pannetta, deputy U.S. marshal, U.S. Department of Justice (phone: STerling 3-5700) took (1) E-Meter serial No. 782 (personal property belonging to me)

from me, gave no receipt for same and only allowed me to record its identifying serial number, in the same manner as reported above. When I queried one of the marshals by whose authority was this action being taken, he showed me an unsigned court order.

I thoroughly resent and object to this unwarranted and extremely highhanded intrusion on my personal, basic rights as a Canadian citizen, and the forceful confiscation of my personal property (1) E-Meter serial No. 782 whilst I was a student here in the Academy of Scientology under the guidance of the Founding Church of Scientology, Washington, D.C., and an authorized visitor to the United States, and hereby do request you to take immediate action in strong protest of the unmitigated actions of U.S. Government officials reported above, and have my personal property immediately returned to me.

Thanking you for your services on my behalf, I remain,
Sincerely,

JOHN P. WOOTE, D.C.

JOSEPH KRAFT ON U.S. POLICY IN ASIA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Joseph Kraft is one of our most knowledgeable and perceptive commentators on events in Asia and on U.S. policy toward that area. I ask unanimous consent to have two of his recent articles from the Washington Post printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**REVERSE DOMINOS
(By Joseph Kraft)**

The divorce of Singapore from Malaysia may turn out to be a blessing in disguise.

On the debit side, a loss of potentially staggering size is now cut in a relatively safe way. On the asset side, the domino theory that has been the base of so much wrong-headed American action in Vietnam is now exposed as a crude and unreliable guide.

From the outset, back in 1963, the Malaysian Federation was a chancy thing. It rested on the natural economic association of the great island port of Singapore with the hinterland of the Malayan peninsula. But Singapore is dominated by Chinese led by a Socialist trades unionist, Lee Kuan Yew, while the peninsula is dominated by Malay Moslems led by a golf-playing dynast, Tunku (or Prince) Abdul Rahman.

To achieve federation at all it was thus necessary to fuse two hostile nationalities under two different kinds of political leadership. For cold war political purposes it was deemed necessary to keep the Chinese and their leftwing leader in the minority. To do that, it was necessary to add to the Federation two former British protectorates in Borneo—Sarawak and Sabah.

Their inclusion precipitated Indonesian territorial claims against the Federation. As a guarantee of the Federation's security, British forces based on Singapore came into action. That in turn invited the charge that the whole Federation was a put-up Western piece of imperialism directed by the United States against the Indonesians and their chief ally in the world, Communist China.

Thus, step by step, there was built up, from local economic necessity, a network of commitments that came to involve the great powers. In Malaysia, the peace of the world was made to rest on a ramshackle structure of conflicting claims and competing nationalisms.

22232

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 8, 1965

The withdrawal of Singapore from the Federation moves toward a safe scaling down of that crazy system. All the details of divorce seem to have been worked out by advance agreement between the Tunku and Lee. Indeed, it was precisely because they made their arrangements in advance and in secret, that the whole world was surprised by the divorce.

But what does all this have to do with the domino theory? Well, the theory is that the states of southeast Asia are like a row of dominoes with Vietnam in the van; and that Vietnam must be given external support, because if she falls, the others will come tumbling after. The events in Malaysia, however, offer vital evidence against the theory in two ways.

First, it is plain that the weakness of the Asian states springs more from internal division than external pressure. The best way to shore up these states is by moving toward solidly based local regimes—as the Tunku is trying to do in Malaysia, and as Lee is trying to do in Singapore. Had they failed to arrange a divorce, the Federation would probably have been blown apart by friction between Malays and Chinese. The dominoes would have been falling in reverse.

Second, the events show that the smaller Asian states are stabilized by simplifying their internal politics, not by loading them down with external commitments. Vietnam has been in trouble steadily since World War II mainly because it was encumbered in impossible outside commitments—first to French colonialism, next to American anti-communism. Thailand, by providing a base for American military and propaganda efforts, now court the same danger.

Malaysia and Singapore, by reducing their entanglement in the East-West opposition, have probably improved their chances for survival. They have followed the Burmese way of noninvolvement. And the Burmese way, as the foremost of Burmese, Secretary General U Thant of the United Nations, once said: "Is very appropriate in the circumstances prevailing in southeast Asia."

THE TECHNIQUE OF "AS IF"

(By Joseph Kraft)

The recent week of secret White House talks on Vietnam has been widely written off as a charade designed to provide an appearance of deep deliberation for decisions already taken. In fact, the White House talks yielded a basic change in the pace and direction of American policy in the Far East.

President Johnson has now explicitly broken away from a policy that was leading to an early and direct military clash with mainland China. And he did it in a way that enabled all of his advisers to go along with the new policy, though most of them had been leading advocates of the old policy.

To understand the breadth of the decision, it is necessary to have a grasp of the strategic view of Asia held in the highest military circles. In this sophisticated and cogent view, the only threat to the American position in the western Pacific comes from Communist China. American superiority in the air and in nuclear weapons would make it relatively easy to handle China at present. But 10 years from now it may not be so easy. China, the theory runs, could then be a real danger.

While rarely stated, this strategic concept has at all times been in the background of American decisions in Vietnam. The war there has been seen as an extension of Chinese power. At every critical juncture, this country has been obliged to go in deeper in order to contain the Chinese. Virtually all possible proposals for negotiations have been scotched as signs of weakness that would only feed the Chinese appetite for conquest.

The most recent White House review began just as all the previous ones. As usual,

there was a military crisis in Vietnam. As usual, Secretary McNamara and his aides went out to examine the situation. As usual, they came back to Washington with new recommendations. As usual, these recommendations amounted to a deeper American military commitment. As usual, the President's chief foreign policy advisers, McGeorge Bundy and Dean Rusk, endorsed the proposals.

For many reasons, however, the President was instinctively suspicious of the whole approach. His most important former Senate colleagues—RICHARD B. RUSSELL, CLINTON P. ANDERSON, J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, MIKE MANSFIELD—were expressing their doubts on the matter. The press was just then full of stories showing how President Kennedy had been trapped by his advisers in the Bay of Pigs fiasco.

But the real art was not to have doubts. The real art was to communicate these doubts in a way that would carry weight with the President's military and political advisers. Mr. Johnson alone, achieved that trick. He did it by the device of posing what may be called "as if" questions.

He listened carefully to all the recommendations. He then asked his advisers to consider the situation, as if all the proposals had been adopted. What would the other side do then? And where would that leave the United States?

At one point, in fact, the President said: "I want every man in this room to think where we will be 3 months from now; where we will be 6 months from now; where we will be a year from now; where we will be 5 years from now; where we will be 10 years from now."

When the answers to the "as if" questions finally came in, the President had on hand not only what he was being asked to do now, but also the whole scenario for the future. It was apparent that what the military wanted was: first, a major effort to drive the Vietcong guerrillas out of South Vietnam; second, an all-out bombing attack on North Vietnam; and third, in the likely event of intervention by Peking air raids on modern military installations that would set China back for at least a decade. A big Asian war, in other words, was just around the corner.

With that ugly prospect exposed, the President's advisers were at last able to back away from the position they had endorsed so many times before. They agreed with the President that it was necessary to change the scenario. Though they accepted the immediate military requests, they also moved, for the first time really, to open a number of doors for a settlement in Vietnam.

The new moves may not work. They may not—and this would be tragic—be pushed very long or very hard. But for the time being the United States is not on a collision course with China. By the technique of "as if," the President has been able to assert the political over the military logic.

TRIBUTE TO ADLAI STEVENSON

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the past weeks have seen an outpouring of countless eulogies honoring a great American, Adlai E. Stevenson. They have come from all parts of the world. They have lauded the way he uplifted American politics, by his nobility of expression and his staunch dedication to the betterment of America and mankind. Many of these eulogies have been printed in the Record, and they form an enduring monument to the respect and affection felt by men all over the world toward Adlai Stevenson.

I would like to add one more, an ex-

ceptionally fine statement by a distinguished Minnesotan. Edward Barness, former editor of the Pope County Tribune of Glenwood, Minn. I have known Ed for a good amount of time, and I have always admired the fine human quality of his writing. I feel that his editorial, "Stevenson Belongs to the Ages," is one of the best he has ever written.

In particular, he points to striking similarities in the lives of Adlai Stevenson and our late President, John Kennedy.

Kennedy and Stevenson were products of the same school of thought, ideals, and aspirations. Both men were keen students of the Bible, and quoted frequently from the oldest book in the world. They were steeped in the great literature of the world and especially that of England. The utterances of the great thinkers of the past, great thoughts that had stood the test of time, became a part of them and their lives. Both were men who dared to back up their convictions and in no uncertain terms. Neither of them were politicians in the true sense of the word. When asked about their stand on a controversial question, they came forth with an answer that could easily be understood. Support and votes might be lost temporarily, but the future of humanity meant more to them. Both are now dead but what they stood for lives on.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial by Ed Barness be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STEVENSON BELONGS TO THE AGES

(By Edward E. Barness)

A great American once said, "I would rather be right than to be President." The same might well be said about Adlai Stevenson who passed away suddenly in London last week, while on duty as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. Stevenson and the late President Kennedy were the two most outstanding men in the world in this generation and will live on in history with men like Lincoln and Gladstone.

Kennedy and Stevenson had very much in common. They were both great intellectual men, men who understood the past and who had the ability to look into the future and to see the turn of events. Both loved justice and peace and were against tyranny the world over. With them their objectives became an obsession and as for their dreams, they never let them die in spite of setbacks and opposition. Both men lived for something bigger than themselves. History is too near to both these men to give them the proper place in the annals of the coming generation, but when their history is written, they will be credited with changing world thought and giving humanity a new vision. This was what both men lived and died for. When these two men appeared on the scene, politics and much legislation had sunk into a sordid mess and people were becoming disillusioned and becoming resigned to a world without hope or escape. Kennedy and Stevenson brought hope and cheer where there was despair, and our Nation and the thinking world, moved into new fields.

Kennedy and Stevenson were products of the same school of thought, ideals and aspirations. Both men were keen students of the Bible and quoted frequently from the oldest book in the world. They were steeped in the great literature of the world and especially that of England. The utterances of the great thinkers of the past, great thoughts that had stood the test of time,

September 8, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

22233

became a part of them and their lives. Both were men who dared to back up their convictions and in no uncertain terms. Neither of them were politicians in the true sense of the word. When asked about their stand on a controversial question, they came forth with an answer that could be easily understood. Support and votes might be lost temporarily, but the future of humanity meant more to them. Both are now dead but what they stood for lives on.

Adlai Stevenson was a candidate for President of the United States in 1952 and 1956. Unfortunately for Stevenson he ran against a returning war hero, Dwight Eisenhower, and all his qualifications did not count. The fact that one party had been in power so many years worked against Stevenson. Although he lost heavily, he drew to his side the most ardent followers and admirers that any candidate has ever had. These followers caught the great dreams of Stevenson and they never lost them. Stevenson's dream revived the Democratic Party and gave it the great strength that it has today. The Stevenson dream for humanity will go on. He was a modern crusader.

Stevenson's greatest dream and hope was the United Nations and he was there when the United Nations was born in San Francisco in 1945. He knew at that time that all the objectives of the United Nations could not be realized in one generation and that law could not make all the peoples of the world behave. He knew that erring humanity in an imperfect world could only realize perfection by degrees. It was fortunate for humanity and the world that President Kennedy appointed Stevenson as our representative to the United Nations and that he was able to labor there in these troublesome years. By his work here, he became a world figure and was looked up to by the nations of the world as an outstanding statesman whose first objective was world peace.

Stevenson put every ounce of energy he had into the United Nations and he was constantly on the go trying to the last to get the majority of the nations to work together for the good of humanity. He was aware of the storm clouds that hovered so near, but he knew that the masses of the world want peace more than anything else and he kept on working until he died with his boots on—the way he would have wanted to go.

Many great men have not been recognized in their time and among them can be mentioned Lincoln and Kennedy. After they are gone, the world wakes up to the fact that they had lived with intellectual giants. Now Stevenson joins that group. Stevenson did not live in vain and he did not die in vain. The name of Stevenson will grow with the years as he joins the immortals of all time.

WATERSHED PROJECTS APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, in order that Senators and other interested parties may be advised of various projects approved by the Committee on Public Works, I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, information on this matter.

Projects approved by the Committee on Public Works on September 8, 1965, under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, Public Law 566, 83d Congress, as amended:

| Project: | Estimated Federal cost |
|---|------------------------|
| Upper Choptank River, Del. and Md.----- | \$3,045,300 |
| Little Raccoon Creek, Ind.----- | 2,521,448 |
| Timber Creek, Kans.----- | 3,489,300 |
| Tamarac River, Minn.----- | 1,177,486 |
| Quapaw Creek, Okla.----- | 3,364,699 |
| Rock Creek, Okla.----- | 1,224,703 |
| Duck Creek, Tex.----- | 1,810,207 |
| Cherrystone, Va.----- | 581,145 |

Total----- 17,214,288

IN VIETNAM, THE POLITICAL STRUGGLE IS OF PRIMARY IMPORTANCE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Mr. James Reston, one of Washington's best columnists, is currently writing a series of highly worthwhile articles from South Vietnam. Two such articles, entitled "Chulal: the Politicians and the Marines" and "Vietnam's Other War: In the Quest for Peasants' Allegiance, U.S. Aids Find Saigon a Languid Ally" appeared in the August 22 and August 23 editions of the New York Times. Mr. Reston cogently argues:

But in the end, the decisive question is not with the determination of the American Government or the American people but with the determination of the South Vietnamese Government and the South Vietnamese people. * * *

In fact, it is almost a cliché to say in Saigon, not only in the American Embassy but even in the American military compound, that while victory at Chulal was important and even essential, it will be necessary in the end to win the people in order to win the war.

I ask unanimous consent to have these articles printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Aug. 23, 1965]

VIETNAM'S OTHER WAR—IN THE QUEST FOR PEASANTS' ALLEGIANCE, U.S. AIDS FIND SAIGON A LANGUID ALLY

(By James Reston)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—The political conduct of the war in Vietnam is a worry to most American officials in Saigon.

They have gone through so many changes of government that they hate to talk about politics in public, but they agree that it is a critical factor in the outcome of the conflict, and it is the central question before Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge. The main fact seems to be that the mass of the people on the land and in the hamlets, more than two-thirds of the population of South Vietnam, are frightened spectators and often victims of the struggle.

They are not engaged in the defense of their communities. They are not protected by their central Government after dark and often not even in the daylight. So they stand aside, obeying the orders of whichever side happens to have the guns at the door, which is usually the Vietcong.

FARMER'S SHARE SPARE

The Saigon Government does not have a popular political base among the people; it has seldom had one. Saigon has not been responsive to their problems. The wealth of this country lies in its agricultural produc-

tion, yet the people on the land and in the hamlets have benefited very little from their own production or from American aid.

They regard their leaders in Saigon as merely the successors of the French colonial regime, with upper-class urban Vietnamese replacing the French.

U.S. officials here, not only in the Embassy but also at military headquarters, are well aware of this problem. The military command concedes that it can win battles like the one last week near Chulal, around bases on the sea, but that it cannot win the constant night-and-day battles in the hamlets all over the country unless the people believe in their Government and fight for their homes and communities. The Americans in the Embassy, and particularly those working in the distant hamlets, agree.

WAR IN EVERY HAMLET

The central question, therefore, is to think about this political problem as steadfastly as the Marines thought about their military problem at Chulal last week. American military power can hold bases on the sea, it can win time, but the war is going on every night in every hamlet in the country, and that is a different problem.

Ambassador Lodge will be confronted by the problem this week when he calls on the leaders of the South Vietnamese Government. It will not be easy. Premier Nguyen Cao Ky indicated before Mr. Lodge arrived that he was not enthusiastic about Mr. Lodge's mission.

When the Ambassador arrived the Premier was out of the country, giving advice to other leaders, in Taiwan and Thailand, about the importance of unity and social justice, which are central problems right here.

Accordingly, there is a tendency in the U.S. mission here to say with considerable reluctance and self-doubt that while the South Vietnamese really should deal with the problem in the hamlets, they will probably not do the job, and the United States will have to take it on.

Mr. Lodge's conviction is that the South Vietnamese must take over the social revolution from the Communists. He emphasized this when he arrived. But his problem is that the Vietnamese leaders are willing neither to take the leadership nor to accept American leadership in this exercise.

Faced with this problem, American leaders are tempted at the moment to give up trying to persuade the Vietnamese Government and, though they do not quite admit it, to sidestep the Vietnamese Government and in the process to replace it.

The victory at Chulal has encouraged this tendency. The U.S. Army and Air Force give the impression that they are yearning to prove elsewhere that they can be as effective as the Marines, and in limited areas, where the military situation favors American power, as at Chulal, this may help.

But the huge problem of the hamlets and the country as a whole remains, and no one in the American leadership here really believes that it can be solved without the cooperation and enthusiasm of the South Vietnamese Government and people.

AFTER VICTORY, WHAT?

There is another aspect, a long-range aspect, to this issue. The basic policy of the United States in Vietnam is to create a military stalemate that will lead to a negotiated settlement in which American power can be withdrawn from this peninsula.

Such a policy assumes that the South Vietnamese will be able to govern and protect the country after the Americans leave, but there is no evidence that they have this capacity, no evidence that they are developing

this capacity—indeed, no evidence that the United States is determined to prepare them for the day when they will have to take over.

Ambassador Lodge, therefore, is a key figure in this problem as he begins his mission with the Vietnamese leaders this week, and he has to work within two policy guidelines that may well be contradictory.

He is expected to cooperate primarily with any government here that is anti-Communist. The present South Vietnamese Government certainly meets this test: It is opposed to the effort of the Communists to take over the country by force.

But at the same time it is essentially a Saigon group, remote from the problems of the people on the land and in the hamlets and backed by the urban upper class, which is undoubtedly anti-Communist too. That class is opposed to the social revolution that the peasants want and the Communists promise.

The second policy guideline before the Ambassador takes account of this point. President Johnson is constantly replying to critics by maintaining that he is following in Vietnam a policy originally introduced by President Dwight D. Eisenhower. But that policy emphasized—and the Johnson administration endorses the emphasis—that American aid is to be given to South Vietnam "provided that your Government is prepared to give assurances as to the standards of performance it would be able to maintain."

REFORMS DEMANDED

An Eisenhower directive of October 23, 1954, added that "the Government of the United States expects that this aid will be met by performance on the part of the Government of Vietnam in undertaking needed reforms . . . responsive to the nationalist aspirations of its people, so enlightened in purpose and effective in performance, that it will be respected both at home and abroad and discourage any who might wish to impose a foreign ideology on the people."

None of this requirement has been carried out, and how this policy is interpreted depends very much on what Ambassador Lodge decides in these next few days.

His mission is divided. The military men are thinking primarily about the power struggle, but the political struggle is equally important. This is the area where both the United States and the South Vietnamese have been weakest in the last decade.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times]

CHULAI: THE POLITICIANS AND THE MARINES (By James Reston)

CHULAI, August 21.—The victory of the marines here on this lonely shoreline of the central Vietnamese lowlands helps clarify the military situation, but does not clarify—and may even confuse—the political problem.

The power of America in these limited military enclaves by the sea is formidable. Particularly when the effective field of battle is limited by a mountain range close to the shore, as it is here, and the enemy cannot launch equal air and naval power from the water, the firepower of the American forces is almost insurmountable.

This is particularly true when such power is exercised by brave and professional men and nobody who has had even a glimpse of the marines here this week is likely to question that they know what they are doing and have the skill to do it.

SECURITY HAVEN

The American positions on this coast, therefore, are as secure as anything can be in an uncertain world. They are being increased. Another base is being constructed in the natural harbor of Cam Ranh south of here, which the Russians used in their war with Japan at the beginning of the century,

and the Japanese used in the last World War. And when the engineers get through with the task of submerging its fuel tanks and constructing its docks, roads and airstrips, nothing short of a massive commitment of manpower from North Vietnam and China could overrun it—and that would change the entire strategy of the war.

The only trouble with this reassuring picture is that the land is not the sea. Outside of the bases on the sea, and outside of Saigon and one or two other cities, this country is terrorized if not controlled by the Vietcong, and even Saigon is riddled with guerrillas and could be overwhelmed by mortars and by plastic bombs and shut off from the sea by sinking a single ship in the channel of the Saigon River any time the Communists chose to adopt a policy of unlimited guerrilla war.

What has happened here at Chulai this week is spectacular news in the United States but hard as it is for us to understand or believe it in America it is not spectacular news among the mass of the people here.

ONE MORE BATTLE

They are not participants, but merely spectators and victims in the struggle. They have been dominated for so many long generations by their own squabbling leaders, by the French and the Japanese, by war and rebellion of every description that one more battle on this lonely coast means very little.

The main hope is that it will mean something to the leaders of North Vietnam, the Communist National Liberation Front in South Vietnam, and the South Vietnamese Government and armed services.

CHANGING ASSUMPTIONS

The Communists have been operating on the assumption that the United States was merely making a political and military demonstration in this country and that it wouldn't fight or wouldn't stick it out.

After what happened to the Vietcong here in Chulai maybe they will change their minds about the American capacity to fight, and if they know anything about American psychology, which is doubtful, they may even conclude that Chulai will increase America's determination to see it through.

But in the end, the decisive question is not with the determination of the American Government or the American people but with the determination of the South Vietnamese Government and South Vietnamese people.

The American effort can hold places like Chulai, and can therefore gain time, but the decisive question is what the South Vietnamese are going to do with the time.

This apparently was what Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge was hinting at discreetly in his statement at the airport in Saigon when he arrived.

He said that the United States was committed to seeing that the military attack on South Vietnam "must and will be ward off," but he emphasized that this fight merely "gives us all the opportunity to bring about a true revolution which will make possible a new and better life for the Vietnamese people."

ESSENCE OF VICTORY

This may sound like the usual soaring jargon out of the State Department, and it annoys a lot of people, who say quite rightly that without military victories there will be no feeling of security among the people, and therefore that military victory is paramount.

Yet it is also true that military victories, particularly at lonely military bases along the coast, will not win the country.

In fact it is almost a cliché to say in Saigon, not only in the American Embassy but even in the American military compound, that while victory at Chulai was important and even essential, it will be necessary in the end to win the people in order to win the war.

PAY RAISES FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the proposal that the administration be given control in initiating pay raises for Federal employees is unsound, unreasonable, and should not be adopted.

Under the Constitution, the people of our country placed the control of the purse strings in the hands of the Congress and not in the executive branch of the Government. It is generally conceded that the Congress by appropriate legislation must decide what the money-spending program shall be and then provide under appropriate legislation the moneys to support that spending.

Now it is proposed that the administration determine the wage rates and the Congress be given power to veto the administration's action.

Admitting that under the President's proposal the Congress would have the power within 60 days after pay raises were granted to veto such raises, it is nevertheless an unchallengeable fact that such veto power is not an adequate substitute for the basic control over expenditures that was vested in the Congress from the time of our Nation's birth. The procedure has been historically that pay boosts are recommended by the President when he thinks they are needed. However, those recommended pay boosts do not go into effect until affirmative action is taken by the Congress approving the proposals.

Inasmuch as the responsibility lies with the Congress to provide a program in which the income and the expenditures of the Federal Government are balanced, it is clear that the absolute power of fixing salaries should be with the Congress and not given to the administration.

The power of the Congress to veto a decision already made by the administration is a weak and unsatisfactory substitute for the initial and final power now residing in Congress either to raise or lower the pay of public servants and officials.

Throughout the history of our country, the Congress has exercised the power to fix pay levels and assume the responsibility to provide the moneys needed to meet the pay levels which it fixed. Under the administration's proposal, it is intended that this historic power and responsibility of the legislative branch will be modified.

The proposal is not sound and I will not support it. I am in agreement with the views expressed by Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, on this important subject.

THE TRUTH ABOUT RUBBER FOOTWEAR

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to an editorial published in this morning's Washington Post, which does a great disservice to that paper's reputation for accuracy as well as to the cause of intelligent legislation. The Post inveighed against the "spokesmen for the domestic rubber boot industry" in connection with

September 8, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

22355

soloist having just returned from a tour with the celebrated Sousa Band. Dr. Meyers—who in June 1965 received an honorary degree from Muhlenberg College—has played with many other great bands, notably those of Pryor, Conway, and Liberatti.

But his very special pride is the Allentown Band, which is described in the following words by John Y. Kohl, longtime editor of the Sunday Call-Chronicle of that city, recently retired but still active in the writing of news about the theater, music, and the arts. Says Mr. Kohl:

The Allentown Band has been offering concerts since the afternoon of July 4, 1828, and thereby lays claim to being America's oldest band.

But far more important, Allentown believes that its band is also "the best band in the land."

And there is plenty of competent testimony to support the claim.

Sousa, Creatore, Goldman—in fact practically all the great bandmasters, living and dead—are as one in their praise of the Allentown Band as the best "town" band in the country.

Allentownians like to remember when the renowned John Philip Sousa, who recruited no less than 18 members of the Allentown Band for his own famous organization, said: "I hope my own band sounds that good."

Creatore announced, "I have never heard a local band so good," while Goldman's appraisal was, "The Allentown Band is without a doubt the finest organized band in America."

And Herbert L. Clark, the dean of cornet soloists, was equally emphatic, "No other city in the country can boast of such a fine band."

The emphasis, of course, is placed on the category, the town band, or what Goldman termed the "organized" band as distinguished from the professional band and the military band.

Playing in a town band is purely an avocation for its members who earn their living in fields other than music. Every community, large or small, has a town band, sometimes several.

So the Allentown Band is a town band but with a difference and what a difference.

There is nothing desultory about the Allentown Band. It is as tightly operated as any of the professional bands. Membership is based strictly on performance and no chair is a sacrosanct by reason of seniority or personal popularity.

Attendance at rehearsals, for which there is, of course, no remuneration, is obligatory, yet many of the members come from a wide area about Allentown and provide their own transportation.

Most remarkable is the fact that the band has a waiting list of no less than 300 from cities and towns throughout eastern Pennsylvania.

The opportunity of playing good music and playing it well in company with other musicians of equally high caliber is the motivating factor that has created this phenomenon among "town" bands.

True, the band fills many engagements, for which, as a unionized group, it is paid, but the individual recompense is only a minor factor compared with the prestige of membership in the famous Allentown Band.

The schedule of engagements during every summer season takes the band afield throughout this part of Pennsylvania, many as repeat events year after year. Its occasional forays to more distant points, in the eastern United States and Canada, never fail to bring acclaim couched in almost unbelievable superlatives.

The fame the band holds in the band world itself is being popularly enhanced in late years by its recordings.

The conductor and guiding genius of this really outstanding organization is one of Allentown's own, Dr. Albertus L. Meyers, whose name has become synonymous with that of the band itself.

Great as was the band throughout its entire history and great as were predecessor conductors who inspired its longevity, without pause for 137 years, Meyers has brought to it the eminence it holds today.

He is constantly in demand as a guest conductor and has led many of today's great bands.

As early as 1939, Meyers was named by Kay Kyser, on a nationwide radio program, as one of the five most famous band leaders, living or dead. The others were Sousa, Pryor, Goldman and Creatore.

At 75, "Bert" Meyers, still of youthful vigor and appearance, is thus the only one of the famous quintette living today and Allentown is planning a communitywide tribute to him during the week of September 6.

A concert in the park to top all such events locally is on the schedule, plus a testimonial dinner on the succeeding evening, with some of the Nation's greatest bandmasters in attendance.

Of course, the Allentown Band will play at both functions, although the likelihood is that Meyers will not be on the podium what with all the other talented conductors on hand to take over.

That Allentown's nationally famous "town" band, which Meyers feels was never better, will acquit itself magnificently is a foregone conclusion.

Albertus L. Meyers received his formal education in the public schools of Allentown, Pa., and Muhlenberg College. "Bert," as he is popularly known to his friends, started the study of music at the age of 9. He studied piano, pipe organ, harmony, and theory under Dr. Clement Marks. He became a soloist on the French horn and cornet and had the benefit of instruction on the former from Anton Horner and from Herbert L. Clarke and Signor Liberatti on the cornet. He also studied band and orchestra arranging with the late Vernon Knauss.

Professionally, he has played for many years in the theaters of Allentown, including 2 years with Donald Voorhees. He played trumpet under Victor Herbert's personal direction for his operetta "Naughty Marietta" and "The Red Mill." He played first horn in Liberatti's band and cornet with the bands of Arthur Pryor and Patrick Conway. He was the cornet soloist with John Philip Sousa and his band. After leaving the Sousa band, he was elected conductor of the famous Allentown Band in 1926, a position he still holds.

Mr. Meyers has had many honors conferred upon him and has filled engagements as guest conductor for the following professional bands: the U.S. Marine Band, the U.S. Air Force Band, the Goldman Band, the Armco Band of Middletown, Ohio, the Philco Band, and the Municipal Band of Hagerstown, Md. He has been guest conductor for all of the district and State music festivals in Pennsylvania and most recently conducted the All-South Jersey High School Band. On the college level, he has guest conducted at Susquehanna, Yale, and Lehigh Universities.

For many years he was the band di-

rector at Allentown High School, where his marching and concert bands are a legend. More recently, he has been director of instrumental music at Muhlenberg College.

Mr. Meyers is a member of the select American Bandmaster's Association, Pennsylvania Music Educator's Association, charter member of the Pennsylvania Bandmaster's Association, and the Sousa Band Fraternal Society, membership in which is limited to those who played with the great Sousa and his band.

Mr. Speaker, I am most proud to join with the citizens of Allentown and the Lehigh Valley in grateful tribute to a man who has done so much to enhance an awareness of and appreciation for fine music over a period of more than a half century.

THE NEED FOR AN ALLIED EFFORT IN VIETNAM

(Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. CLEVELAND) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleague Mr. Rogers of Florida in introducing legislation to attempt to prevent our allies from trading with the enemy. The bill would prohibit the transportation of goods, to or from U.S. ports, aboard ships of any foreign country which allows ships sailing under the flag of that country to be used in trade with Communist North Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, the realization that the war in Vietnam is an American war should not come as much of a surprise to us. There is no question in my mind that the United States, as the leader of the free world, does in fact have the obligation to insure that the unprotected nations of the world have the right to freedom and peace. However, I have great difficulty in understanding why our Nation, great and powerful as it is, must shoulder the entire burden.

Within the last few years we have discovered that our containment policy has not worked as well against Asian communism as it did against Soviet communism in Europe. The geography of the area, the nature of our overextended military and political commitments there, the naive and neutralist mentality of the peoples whose homelands we are struggling to save from aggressive Chinese communism, and the insufficiency of our own resources to cope with this gigantic problem—all of those and certain other forces have brought us to the present impasse.

The unfortunate phase of this involvement is that there seems no easy and honorable way out. There may be an outside chance for us to extricate ourselves from this Asiatic trap if our allies and the people directly concerned join us wholeheartedly, doing their level best and contributing their fair share in this relentless struggle.

Unfortunately, the unwillingness of our allies to play their part, and the total

indifference of the peoples directly concerned have brought about an unenviable, impossible situation.

When we committed ourselves to the defense of these countries against surging, revolutionary Chinese communism, we were not alone in this undertaking. Other governments also vowed to join us in this task. Alliances were formed and specific agreements were signed for this purpose. And, of course, the governments of the countries threatened by communism solemnly and gladly undertook to deal effectively with Communists within their respective countries. Subsequently, however, the Chinese threat seemed real and the Communists in these countries, instead of being held down, were gathering strength and gaining the upper hand against inefficient and corrupt governments. Then we felt that we had to intervene. We did this in South Vietnam in order to strengthen the government there so that it could and would stave off the deadly Communist threat. That well-intended move was a factor in creating the very delicate, difficult and dangerous situation in Vietnam today.

Four years ago, I complained of free world shipping to Communist bloc nations and recently our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, again called this matter to our attention.

According to unclassified figures available through Defense Department sources, 476 ships flying the flags of free world nations called at North Vietnam ports during the period between January 1964 and June 1965.

Incredible as it may seem, our friends sent more than a ship a day last year to supply our enemy, even as our own troops were being killed by the North Vietnamese officered and supplied Vietcong.

I do not believe that the cargoes being unloaded in Hanoi by our friends are not of a military value. I say, Mr. Speaker, that any supplies received by the Hanoi Government are needed by them and consequently are used to defeat our efforts to contain the Communist spread in southeast Asia.

My personal feeling and honest opinion about our commitment in Vietnam is that we have overextended ourselves. We have burdened ourselves with far heavier and onerous responsibilities that cannot be discharged honorably alone. In our defense commitments we are let down by our allies in this almost impossible task of securing a durable peace with freedom.

That is the essence and substance of our present situation as I see it. I feel that it is time to stop talking and begin to put forth our best efforts to solve this inequitable situation. Americans are fighting and dying every day some 10,000 miles from our shores, and I think it is not untimely nor unfair to expect some help in our struggle to preserve the freedom of the affected nations.

At the very minimum, I think the President should exert some leadership by calling on our allies to stop their trade with the North Vietnamese and the Red Chinese.

But beyond this, Congress should enact this bill and thereby prevent the

use of American ports by ships of any foreign nation which allows its ships to trade with the North Vietnamese. Maybe then our allies will realize that they, too, have an obligation to defend the freedom which their young men no doubt cherish as much as ours.

THE BEAUTIFUL PEDERNALES

(Mr. OTTINGER (at the request of Mr. HATHAWAY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, many suburban and rural communities surrounding our great metropolitan complexes are facing a threat of serious proportions. As the power needs of the metropolitan centers grow, and it is necessary to bring electrical power in from great distances, these communities are being dissected by a growing number of power corridors bringing high-voltage lines in on unsightly towers. In some areas, such as Westchester and Putnam Counties in my own district, the destruction is already so great as to jeopardize the continued existence of these towns as attractive residential communities. In others, such as Chester County, Pa., and Baltimore County, Md., the power lines are, so to speak, beating at the door. These communities are disturbed and fighting.

For many hundreds of other towns and villages, the ruthless destruction of steel towers and high-voltage lines is merely on the drawing boards or hidden in utility master plans for the future. These communities are sleeping.

The awareness, however, is spreading. Only this week Newsweek magazine carried a note about developments in Texas:

THE BEAUTIFUL PEDERNALES

President Johnson's plans for beautifying the Nation's highways may be moving slowly in Congress, but back at the L.B.J. ranch things are happening. The Pedernales Electric Cooperative has just put underground several hundred feet of overhead utility lines at the ranch.

Concerned citizens' groups are rallying. Progressive, forward-looking newspapers are alerting the public. When I introduced the Underground Power Transmission Act of 1965 and two related measures on August 17, newspapers across the Nation took up the challenge. The Louisville (Ky.) Courier Journal and the New York Times are among the papers that have taken a position of leadership.

I would like to present to this distinguished body two other particularly outstanding editorial statements that demonstrate the urgency of the problem for our American towns and villages:

[From Newsday, Long Island, Aug. 23, 1965]

PUT THEM UNDERGROUND?

One of the prime uglifying agents of the suburbs and the open countryside is the overhead utility pole—electric or telephone. But it costs too much for the utilities to put them underground unless rates are sharply increased to the consumer.

Representative RICHARD OTTINGER, Democrat, of Westchester, has come up with a promising solution to this problem. He

would provide tax benefits to utilities that buried their lines. Such benefits would allow utilities to depreciate underground transmission facilities for tax purposes in 5 years rather than the present 30; would provide that 49 percent of the construction cost would be a tax credit, to be spent for more such construction; and would provide a \$30 million Federal study of improved methods of burying powerlines.

All in all, a constructive idea. The sooner America can get rid of some of its electric-telephone poles and metal pylons, the sooner America will become more beautiful.

[From the Putnam County Courier, Aug. 26, 1965]

WITHIN REASON

(By Betsy Holland Gehman)

The British have a lovely slang phrase that enjoys enormous currency. Its uses are, rather unfortunately universal. The phrase is "Up the pole." Its meaning: balmy, bats, nutty, craze, insane. To say that someone is up the pole is to say that he is a completely hopeless case.

It is, therefore, not unmeaningful when I make note of the fact (as I'm sure you have) that, since last May the New York Telephone Co. has had an army of men in what appears to be permanent residence up the pole. Out along Route No. 301, where a full platoon of green-clad men have been playing Shipwreck Kelly for 3 full months now, Ma Bell has added a few little homey touches to their aeries, such as tents to protect them from the sun and rain, plus, I have no doubt, Bunsen burners for cookouts, sleeping bags, and a full supply of Band-Aids—not for themselves, but to patch up the shabby little connective wires that somehow seem to get all discombobulated every time we have the teensiest little thunderstorm, a natural enough phenomenon to everyone but the telephone company.

As this paper fully chronicled on May 13 last, our community's telephone service had been disrupted for over a week, in some cases 2 weeks, by a lightning strike on one telephone pole. Again, early this month, hundreds of telephones were put out of service by the ever-popular lightning. This time, silence reigned for 5 days. As an added fillip, my own phone was given an extra 12-hour vacation last Friday due to a short circuit. When I called the repair service, the man who answered assured me nothing could be done about it until the next day, because "all the men are dog tired from being up the poles since May." This same man of science informed me that the telephone company was not prepared to "fight God." Now I submit that is a piece of blasphemy I would have preferred not to hear. I do not believe God is responsible for the willfulness, sloth and profit-grabbing self-interest the telephone company quite ostentatiously indulges itself in.

It should interest everyone who has been victimized by this particular public utility and that includes everyone who has a phone, to learn that Congressman RICHARD L. OTTINGER introduced three bills before the 89th Congress August 17, 1965, that are aimed at getting all overhead transmission lines put underground where they belong.

He pointed out that today more than 300,000 miles of overhead transmission lines eat up a total of nearly 7 million acres of land. He pointed out that expert evaluation has shown that as much as 300 acres of property have been devalued for every mile of powerline installed in already developed communities. (By 1980; there will be need for triple the amount of present transmission facilities.) He pointed out that private utilities have failed to undertake even limited programs up to now because "they fear that once they start going underground, they will be forced to put all lines underground. Fear

September 8, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A5063

If the war continues there's likely to be considerable propaganda by those, with different and often conflicting motives, to the effect that American boys are suffering and dying far from home, while here the stay-behinds live in luxury and comfort.

But this is altogether different from saying that the Government must now begin to choose between cut-backs on welfare programs and meeting our military needs. For the foreseeable future we are able to afford both.

Curtain Lifts a Trifle**EXTENSION OF REMARKS****HON. DAVID S. KING**

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1965

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the tremendous feats of space exploration of the last few years have been marred by the aura of secrecy and the cut-throat competition between the United States and the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union particularly has kept its space program shrouded in mystery; telling virtually nothing about experiments either before or after they are attempted, and revealing very little about whatever scientific facts are subsequently uncovered. The United States has at least told beforehand of launches and has released most scientific discoveries made. More importantly, the United States has allowed the space flights of her astronauts to be reported in their entirety to the country and the world.

A new step toward understanding was taken recently when President Johnson invited the Soviet Union to send an observer to the launching of Gemini 6 in October. While it is not immediately apparent what the response of the Soviet Government will be, the importance of the Johnson invitation is apparent. The President is attempting to encourage communications between the two space giants. At the same time, he is demonstrating the U.S. confidence and capability in space.

An editorial which appeared in the Salt Lake City Tribune August 27 recognizes the importance of the Johnson venture. I think that these opinions merit a wider public disclosure and, therefore, present them here:

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, Aug. 27, 1965]

CURTAIN LIFTS A TRIFLE

In inviting the Soviet Union to send a top scientist to the launching of Gemini 6 next October, President Johnson made a gesture of good will which emphasized the openness of American society. It is also possible that, by providing a grandstand seat, he would like to impress the Soviets with U.S. accomplishments in space exploration.

Press dispatches from Moscow indicate the Kremlin is not likely to accept, perhaps believing that Mr. Johnson hopes an exchange of visits can be arranged later. The United States has announced its space flights in advance and has given them full publicity while in progress. The Soviet Union has been far more secretive, though in recent months more and more information has been released.

This week the Kremlin lifted the curtain a bit further with the premiere of a document-

tary film about Lt. Col. Alexei A. Leonov's first walk in space. The movie shows Leonov emerging from Voskhod II and floating freely in space. Also included are brief closeups of the assembly of a booster rocket, the interior of Voskhod II while in orbit and unusual scenes of the recovery of earlier cosmonauts along with their heat-charred space vehicles.

The film emphasizes Soviet achievements without revealing Soviet secrets, a course the United States has always followed in the coverage of its space flights. Obviously the spur of competition has awakened the Kremlin to the value of publicity.

We hope the trend continues. When restrictions on communication are lifted, better understanding is almost inevitable.

Vietcong's Goal Is Overthrow of Existing Government**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the Vietcong's goal is the overthrow of the existing government. This is the conclusion of James V. Hall, AID official in Vietnam and a former East-West Center grantee, after a tour of duty in Vietnam. Mr. Hall's views were expressed in an interview by the Honolulu Star-Bulletin on September 2, 1965. The newspaper account reads as follows:

NOT IDEALISTS, OFFICIAL SAYS—OVERTHROW REGIME IS VIETCONG GOAL

The Vietcong should not be visualized as simple, downtrodden peasants struggling against overwhelming odds.

Neither should they be considered a collection of insidious fiends bent on terror and destruction, according to a visiting AID (Agency for International Development) official.

James V. Hall, AID official in Vietnam and a former East-West Center grantee, said last night "both of these idealized concepts do great harm to a deeper understanding of what is going on in Vietnam."

Although there may be among the ranks of the Vietcong some idealistic young men fighting for what they believe to be right, they are far from being representative of the Vietcong, Hall said.

"And although there are certainly some insidious and diabolical thugs among the Vietcong," Hall said, "they, too, are not representative of the Vietcong as a whole."

The plan of the Vietcong, he explained, is "a protracted struggle conducted methodically in order to attain specific intermediate objectives leading to the final overthrow of the existing order."

In this master plan, Hall said, no one individual matters; no one thing matters.

The only thing that matters is the final overthrow of the existing government, he said.

Concerning the civilians' role in Vietnam, Hall said, eight free world nations from Europe, Asia, and America are providing much needed medical assistance.

"In all," he said, "52 doctors and 147 medical assistants from nurses to laboratory technicians are working daily, sometimes around the clock, to save lives and provide medical care which could otherwise be lacking."

The eight nations are Australia, France, Italy, Japan, South Korea, New Zealand, the Philippines, and the United States.

The largest single contingent comes from South Korea, he said.

Hall pointed out that problems to be worked on during the coming year in Vietnam include the elimination of the black market, improving customs and tax collections and foreign exchange control and the establishing of priorities for allocation of manpower.

Victory for L.B.J. and OAS**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include at this point in the Record, Virginia Prewett's recent column on the progress which is being made in the attempts to reach a solution to the Dominican problem. The article points out the importance to the United States of the recent break in the stalemate and of the OAS action which helped bring that break about:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Sept. 3, 1965]

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC PACIF VICTORY FOR L.B.J. AND OAS

(By Virginia Prewett)

The settlement of the Dominican stalemate is a great triumph for President Johnson's foreign policy. It is equally a triumph for the OAS majority who backed up U.S. policy in Santo Domingo in the face of shrill criticism.

Obviously, the die-hard Communists and the die-hard military clique in Santo Domingo will remain threats to the Dominican nation's chances for peace and reconstruction.

But both sides have long since lost both their domestic and foreign support. As the realities have grown clearer with time, the hemisphere-wide hubbub over "intervention" in Santo Domingo has gradually died down everywhere except among the extremists.

TOP CHANGE

The most significant change of front has been that of the Christian Democratic Party.

At one time, this group which controls Chile's administration, officially supported the thesis that the OAS peace force should be withdrawn from Santo Domingo and the Caamano Deno faction should be recognized as the legal government of the republic.

Chilean officials also condemned the United States and OAS actions in Santo Domingo as an "outrage."

However, the meeting of hemisphere Christian Democratic leaders, held in Venezuela very recently, voted for the formation of a Dominican provisional government—the United States and OAS solution.

DECLINED SUPPORT

The 30 Christian Democrats who attended the meeting also declined to support the Christian Democratic representatives from the Caamano Deno camp against those from the junta side. The Dominican factions were told to settle their own differences.

Meanwhile, in the Dominican Republic, the intransigent military and the Communist

A5064

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 8, 1965

hardliners tried up to the last to prevent a peaceful settlement.

For instance, the mortar shells fired into the OAS peace force on the eve of the final accord obviously came from the northern sector controlled by the Imbert forces.

GAMBLE FAILED

The Imbert junta's last-gasp gamble for popular support on Sunday, August 29 proved a resounding failure. The junta promised to get out 100,000 supporters. Less than 10,000 showed up.

On the rebel side, the die-hard Communist groups also failed more than once to prove they had popular support. And the sincere Democrats around Col. Caamano Deno have had a prolonged object lesson during the months when they have been bottled up with the extreme leftists.

For at the beginning of the enforced truce, the leftist extremists were estimated to control less than a third of the militants around Colonel Caamano. But Colonel Caamano gradually saw the Communist militants get control of about two-thirds of his penned-up force. At times Colonel Caamano himself was virtually their prisoner.

Socioeconomic Forces Assure Vending's Global Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 8, 1965

MR. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, when this body recently passed the Coinage Act of 1965 it solved some pressing problems for many businessmen. Among those is the young but flourishing food vending industry. One of the Nation's outstanding manufacturers of food vending machines is located in my district and I was very proud sometime ago to see that the organization, the Vendo Co., was presented with an "E" Award by the Department of Commerce for excellence in international trade. At that time, the president of the company, E. F. Pierson, outlined the story of the rapid growth of the industry both here and abroad. I commend his remarks to you, Mr. Speaker, and to our colleagues:

SOCIOECONOMIC FORCES ASSURE VENDING GLOBAL INCREASE

The concept of automatic merchandising is spreading throughout the world at a much more rapid rate than is generally recognized.

In virtually every country, on every continent, a total of more than 5 million automatic venders sell approximately \$5,800 million of merchandise annually.

On a global basis, automatic merchandising is growing at a rate of 16 percent annually, and there is nothing on the horizon to indicate it has reached its peak. On the contrary, there is every reason to believe vending has only begun a long upward climb.

For many years, automatic merchandising has been considered one of the important growth industries of the United States, and it is still growing at a healthy rate of 9 percent each year, 50-percent faster than the 6-percent increase shown by gross national product. As a matter of fact, vending in this country has consistently topped itself in sales each year for the past four decades; last year's \$3.5 billion represents an alltime high. Differences between this country's rate of

growth and that of the world at large are explained in terms of a greater volume of sales here, as well as the rapid expansion of overseas markets.

As vending expands its worldwide scope, it is affecting many related fields of activities. Its impact on other areas is revealed in the following figures:

Steel: More than 92,000 tons of steel and 62,000 tons of tin plate are used in the manufacture of vending equipment.

Automotive industry: Approximately 78,000 cars and trucks service vending machines, using 240,000 tires and 98 million gallons of gas annually. Gasoline requirements equal 57 tank cars each working day.

Agriculture: Total farm land under cultivation for raising products sold through venders amounts to 1,850,000 acres.

Each year, the following amounts of products are sold through venders:

[In millions of pounds]

| | |
|--------------|-------|
| Nuts----- | 140 |
| Sugar----- | 1,025 |
| Corn----- | 100 |
| Tobacco----- | 256 |
| Wheat----- | 138 |

The entire yield of approximately 178,000 cows is required for vended products.

Packaging Materials: Items packaged in paper, plastic or foil for vended candy, food, cigarettes, and other products number 14,500 million annually.

Paper cups and cartons alone, stacked one on top of the other, would stretch 410,000 miles—from here to the moon and almost back.

TRENDS ASSURE GROWTH

In looking ahead to the continued expansion of vending in the marketplaces of the world, we see that the same elements which have formed a pattern for vending's rapid growth in the United States exist virtually every place in the world today.

Three fundamental trends assure vending's growth on an international scale: Rising populations; bettered economic conditions, due in great part to new prosperity through increased industrialization; and a new sociological concept of the dignity of the individual.

In every country in the world, rising populations are swelling consumer markets. The population explosion is not confined to any one nation or continent. The Gallatin Annual of International Business lists these annual population percentage increases: United States, 1.6; India, 2.3; Germany, 1.3; France (metropolitan areas), 1.2; the Netherlands, 1.3; United Kingdom, 0.8; South Africa, 2.6; and Japan, 0.9.

Far more significant, however, than the sheer increase in numbers of persons on the globe, are socioeconomic developments which are literally changing the face of our world.

MORE JOBS, BETTER PAY

Emerging nations, bettered standards of living, greater industrialization of former agricultural nations—all these things are creating a new concept of man and his place in society. As more and more countries move from agricultural to industrial economies, more jobs become available in technical and production fields, offering better pay than those which for centuries provided the only type of work available. These jobs are creating new middle classes in many countries which formerly recognized only very wealthy and very poor groups. The very existence of these new middle classes acts as a leaven throughout society, putting new emphasis on the dignity of the individual man. Native ability rather than the accident of birth, is the new criterion. On numerous levels, man now enjoys greater freedom and greater opportunity to advance his personal fortunes than his forbears ever knew.

Along with this new concept of the dignity and worth of the individual, however, frequently comes resistance to time-honored forms of livelihood. Changing concepts of occupational status often make it difficult to obtain help in such vital areas as personal catering. As new jobs unfold, and men see glimmering vistas ahead or even greater opportunities, there is less and less inclination to enter work areas which are traditionally associated with catering to the needs of others.

In this new world, where bettered economic conditions are frequently accompanied by shrinking labor supplies in basic service areas, vending fills a gap between ancient customs and modern demands. By placing volume food catering on a self-service basis, vending frees the individual man from the role of servant, while at the same time providing modern facilities to take care of stepped-up demands for food and refreshment in the new marketplaces of the world.

SHORTAGE OF FOOD WORKERS

Shortages of labor in the food service field in the United States have become increasingly apparent in recent years. These shortages include both top-level supervisory people and those who assume less responsibility, down to and including busboys and cleanup help. At the top, the shortage is less noticeable to the casual observer. There are many fine dining establishments, operating on a very prosperous basis. Behind the scenes, however, competition for food supervisors is keen. Although 59 colleges in the United States are accredited to offer food service degrees, there are not enough graduates to meet the demand, and enrollment in these courses is not showing the tremendous increase evident in other academic areas. Young people with food service degrees are eagerly sought out by restaurateurs, but the managerial group which is being developed is not sufficient to fill all available positions.

A logical way for management to solve the need for food service supervisors is to dip into secondary levels and elevate cafeteria managers and hostess-managers to positions of greater authority. In some cases this is a good solution, but for the most part it merely compounds the problem of staffing a good restaurant or cafeteria, taking individuals away from jobs where they are making valuable contributions, and creating new vacancies at lower levels.

It is as difficult to find qualified persons for second-level food service jobs as it is to find managerial personnel. There is a sharp decrease in the numbers of workers entering the food service area at secondary or lower levels. Who wants to cook or make salads or wait tables or clean when he or she can get a job with better pay or better hours at a local industry? Many of these persons regard their jobs as temporary, until something better comes along.

An official of the Hilton Hotel organization remarked recently that one of his major problems is finding and keeping trained and dependable persons for semiskilled and unskilled jobs. In order to staff their kitchens, chain hotels conduct training sessions for kitchen and restaurant personnel in virtually every city in which they operate—and repeat these sessions endlessly, in order to keep up with normal labor turnover.

In their search to find help, many major hotel and restaurant chains have been reaching into European labor markets to recruit workers. But now, with unparalleled prosperity in Europe, this supply is dwindling. Men who formerly took pride in being waiters or assistant cooks now often aspire to a different kind of work; girls who normally would look for work as waitresses now want dress-up jobs.

AUTOMATIC SERVICE A SOLUTION

In casting about for ways of solving this problem of insufficient help, some companies

A5066

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 8, 1965

of separation of powers, States rights, and the very definition of the Federal system itself, has no such provision.

5. The Johnson bill outlaws all literacy tests in States covered by the bill. The Republican bill provides that a sixth-grade education will raise a presumption of literacy and that those with less than a sixth-grade education may still be able to prove that they are literate.

6. The Johnson bill fixes criminal penalties against both officials and private citizens for coercion and intimidation of prospective voters. Since the mandate against racial discrimination in the 14th and 15th amendments runs against officials only and not private citizens, these penalties are subject to constitutional attack. The Republican bill provides penalties against officials only.

This brief explanation clearly shows that the Republican bill will safeguard the constitutional rights of the States and individuals. This is the problem Congress will face to take the President's disastrous bill or the Republican bill.

There will be no other choice.

To reiterate my own position:

1. I believe that every qualified American citizen should have the right to vote.

2. I believe that right is guaranteed under present laws and that no new legislation is necessary.

3. I believe that we must prevent the President's bill from becoming law if we are to save our present form of Government, a representative Republic.

in file
It Is Reds Who Want To War, War Not

Jaw, Jaw

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

— OF —

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 7, 1965

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the United States has not been idle by any means in seeking a solution to the war in Vietnam. The Sacramento, Calif., Bee, in an August 31, 1965, editorial, recapitulates the efforts made by our Government and other nations since last summer to encourage discussions which will ultimately lead to honorable negotiations.

I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

IT IS REDS WHO WANT TO WAR, WAR NOT
JAW, JAW

For the record, it should be emphasized that the U.S. declaration that it is willing—and will remain willing—to negotiate its quarrel in Vietnam is not an idle pronouncement. It has backed up this assurance repeatedly with overtures for the last year and intercessors concerned with the trend of things in Vietnam—England, for example—have at the urging of the United States appealed to the Communists to cease fire and talk.

To document that record, let us go back to late summer, 1964, and pick it up from there.

In August 1964, U.N. Secretary General U Thant at the suggestion of the United States offered to visit Hanoi and Peiping to discuss resolution of the Vietnam crisis. He was spurned by the Reds.

In February 1965, Britain proposed that the Geneva Conference be reconvened to explore the dispute. Communism balked.

In April 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson in a speech at Johns Hopkins University offered "unconditional discussions" and the Communists charged: "Swindle."

In the same month Foreign Secretary Patrick Gordon Walker of Great Britain went on a peace mission to Hanoi and to Peiping. In both capitals he was refused an audience.

There were two other developments in April—nonaligned nations urged a settlement and North Vietnam and Red China refused to consider the petition. India called for a cease fire and maintenance of present borders. Peiping and Hanoi both vetoed the proposal.

In May 1965, President Johnson called off bombing raids over North Vietnam for 5 days to demonstrate this Nation's anxiousness to negotiate and all the moratorium won from the Reds was the smear: "Hoax."

Also in May, a Canadian envoy asked of Hanoi its conditions for peace and was told this would require the unconditional withdrawal of all U.S. forces. This, of course, was neither possible nor feasible.

In June, Britain's Prime Minister Harold Wilson sought to set up a peace plan and was branded by Peiping as a "nitwit." In July, a British leftwing leader, Harold Davies, went to Hanoi to seek the Communists' terms. He too was rejected.

So reads the record of the American and the free world effort to bring the Communists to the negotiations table.

Mao Tse-tung may have summed up the Communist attitude most precisely when he said one does not negotiate a war away when one is winning.

China and Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1965

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, as the fighting wears on in Vietnam, we in America are beginning to learn what it is to fight this new and stubborn enemy; we are beginning to learn what makes him act and think the way he does. Yet, we must not tire of learning more about him; as long as the Asian Communist is our enemy, he is our concern.

I feel that the American people should look carefully at what another Asian has to say about Chinese Communist ambitions. Dr. Purnendu Kumar Banerjee had 2½ years of service as India's Charge d'Affairs in Peiping before coming to the Indian Embassy in Washington as Minister. He gave an address on July 14, entitled "China and Southeast Asia" in which he describes the Communist Chinese mentality and ambitions in an acutely interpretive manner.

While I want to stress that I do not take sides in the unfortunate clashes of the past week between India and her neighbor, Pakistan, I do feel that Dr. Banerjee's comments are worth careful consideration.

The speech follows:

CHINA AND SOUTHEAST ASIA

(By Dr. Purnendu Kumar Banerjee)

As all of you know, the Chinese Communists are followers of military conquest. I will start with a quotation from Mao Tse-

tung, chairman of the Chinese Communist Party. "The struggle for socialism may require nuclear war. No one can foresee the number of human lives which a future war may take. It may be one-fourth of the inhabitants of the world. Half of mankind could easily be destroyed, but the other half would survive. In half a century, or a whole century, the population would grow again by more than half." This statement was made in Moscow in 1958.

Here is another statement made later on regarding the liberation movement in southeast Asia and South America. "The war will be a bridge over which mankind will pass into a new era in history. The world can only be reorganized by means of rifles. We stand in revulsion of war—we have no use for it. But war can only be abolished through war. If you want war to go out of existence, stick to the rifle and the battlefield." This is the philosophy of China, and through this philosophy China is trying to conquer southeast Asia.

CHINESE COMMUNIST OBJECTIVES

All of you know of the aggression that took place in November 1962. To most of you it is known as a territorial problem, but it is not a territorial problem. It is a symptom of the political ambitions that China has in southeast Asia, and it is a very significant symptom. I firmly believe that if this territorial problem were settled, that there would still be the Chinese threat.

China's ambition is to influence, if not to control, the whole of Asia. One of the major objectives is India. The Chinese are therefore continuing their effort, using military, political, economic, and diplomatic methods. The Chinese will again apply military methods to India at the time that suits her and at the place convenient to her.

Now look for a moment to see how Communist China lives today. Economically, politically, and communistically they have made certain progress. I have seen malnutrition, but I have never seen starvation in China. They seem able to equalize the poverty.

You find a deep rift between the Soviet Union and China. What the future will be is very difficult to say. I believe that the rift will develop further between the two Communist parties, but not between the two countries.

Some of the western European countries are watching the Chinese market. However, the Chinese Communist market is now a very limited market. The Chinese do not have enough foreign exchange to buy the things they want from abroad. In addition, the Chinese have to pay for the grain that they need to buy each year from countries like Canada, Australia, and Argentina. Also it is not possible for other countries to have trade with China on a profitable basis because the type of consumer goods and light industrial goods the Chinese are producing are not quality goods, and they will not find a market in an advanced country.

THE COMMUNIST METHOD

Chinese political diversity depends on military preparedness. The Chinese have the largest land army in the world, including about 200 divisions. These divisions are not equipped in a sophisticated way, it is true. But their equipment and training fit into China's plan of infiltration, guerrilla warfare, and subversion. These are the characteristics of the Communist wars in Asia, in South America, and in Africa. From that point of view, the vast land army, traditionally equipped with small arms, is just suitable for the purpose.

To achieve their objective, the Chinese are applying a twofold method. One is an interparty approach, and the other is an interstate approach.

September 8, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A5065

are turning to vending for their volume food operations. In large-scale food programs, where many persons are served regularly, vending has already made a significant impact on food service in this country.

The preparation of food in central kitchens for distribution to outlying points makes it possible to reap several benefits. In the first place, fewer workers are required, and the services of top echelon people can be used to best advantage. Secondly, those who work in central kitchens have the advantage of regular hours, steady work schedules and production-type jobs—significant factors in stabilizing employment. In the third place, food of consistent quality can be served on a volume basis, meeting today's sophisticated demands for high quality even though food is mass-produced and mass-served. Last and by no means least, substantial savings of time and money may be effected with vending.

We have termed this new concept of food service a "revolution in distribution"—and we can look for a much more rapid development of automatic service in other countries than we have seen in the United States. Many things have already been pioneered—vending equipment, packaging, methods of preparing food and serving it. Engineering, market research, public acceptance—much of the basic work has already been done, and techniques need only be applied as the demand arises in other lands. Timing is still the important thing, but it is more a matter of when than how.

JAPAN WELCOMES VENDING

Japan, with the only modern industrialized economy in Asia, is making rapid strides in vending. As Japan moves toward a broad-based consumer economy, large-scale foreign competition is forcing wages up.

Japan's GNP shows the highest percentage increase of any nation during the past 4 years—66.6 percent, as compared with 7.9 percent for the United States. Japanese people have more money to spend than they did formerly, and they like to spend it in a manner which reflects a westernized way of life.

Automatic coolers for soft drinks and coffee venders are found in many public places in Japan today. Service stations and garages offer their customers automatic refreshment; offices have coffee venders in convenient locations. A number of completely automatic food facilities have been opened in urban centers, and people respond readily to the concept of automatic service. The "snack" eating habit, so prevalent in the West, fits into the Japanese custom of eating a number of small meals a day. I have noticed that while older people always sit down to dine, whether they are eating a full meal or merely drinking a beverage, young people are adopting the practice of eating a snack out of hand as they stroll about. As Western and Eastern customs merge, automatic merchandising is finding ready-made acceptance.

LIVELY EUROPEAN MARKETS

In my recent travels I have had occasion to observe the casual manner in which Europeans take automatic venders for granted. Especially in West Germany I was impressed with the amount of vending on the autobans. Both food and refreshment are available to motorists in automatic venders in wayside stations. I would say there is a good deal more highway vending in Germany than in this country, and in terms of speed and good food at reasonable prices, it is a boon to the motorist.

Germany, where labor receives the highest wages in Europe, offers a lively market for

the full range of modern vending equipment. Its recreational and leisure-time activities are booming—bowling, boating, touring, and so forth, and all consumer tastes are sophisticated, commensurate with a growing discretionary purchasing power.

France, which still has substantial inequities in income and living levels, is also moving in the direction of a high-consumption economy and French metropolitan centers offer new markets for vending. Italy, surging with unmatched speed into our 20th century industrial renaissance, is sending national purchases to record levels. In Italy there is increasing emphasis on vocational and on-the-job training, because of a high percentage of unskilled workers, and a brand new worker class is coming into being, representing great consumer potential.

MEXICO'S BREAKTHROUGH

One of the most dramatic settings for a vending installation in any part of the globe is found in Mexico City, at the new National Museum of Anthropology. In this beautiful building, one of the most handsome in the world, a modern automatic cafeteria offers a remarkable contrast to the wonders of an ancient civilization. In the midst of a great treasury of Mexican art and culture, an installation of automatic food and refreshment venders provides the most advanced type of volume food service the world has devised. Mexican citizens are feeding pesos into the venders at a rate which surpasses expectations. Sales from the automatic cafeteria, in fact, are greater than those of a conventional cafeteria in the same building.

Also in Mexico City, coffee venders are being used in new office buildings as management copes with the "break" concept which is basic in today's workaday world. Office hours from 8 to 5 mean that employees must either have on-premise sources of refreshment, or be allowed to leave the premises—and management absorbs the loss when work schedules are interrupted by trips away from the office. Automatic venders, by providing a convenient source of refreshment, keep workers in the buildings and help make labor more productive.

In 1960, for the first time in Mexico's history, the urban population outnumbered the rural, and there is a rising middleclass and professional elite. Per capita income, although rising, is still only between \$400 and \$500 in urban areas, but Mexico's forward progress makes it inevitable that it will represent an excellent market for all types of consumer products in the years ahead.

I could list specific examples of the growing acceptance of vending in many other countries. In the United Kingdom, vending is well on the way to becoming a national way of life, as installations in factories provide good, low-cost food for industrial workers, and street venders offer a convenience for the average citizen. In many European countries, "store front" vending has been practiced for many years, bridging the gap between consumer demands and restricted hours of sales. In Saudi Arabia, the popularity of carbonated soft drinks is opening the way for expanded automatic service.

In virtually every instance, vending is adapted to meet a specific need. It is both flexible and universal, and there is every reason to believe that in the years ahead we will see an acceleration of automatic merchandising on a worldwide basis which will make everything which has happened to date in our vigorous industry seem scarcely worth mentioning in comparison.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my newsletter, Washington Report, of April 6, 1965:

WASHINGTON REPORT—THE VOTING RIGHTS BILL
(By Congressman JIM MARTIN, Seventh District, Alabama)

Congress is going to pass a voting rights bill. My personal belief is that no new legislation is necessary. There are enough laws on the books now to protect the right of every qualified American citizen to vote without discrimination because of his color, his race, or his religion. Proper enforcement of present laws would assure that right. However, we are faced with a situation which is unprecedented in American history. The President has demanded that Congress pass a bill on voting rights and, spurred by the emotion which is gripping our country at the present time, Congress will pass such a bill. So when Members of Congress vote on this bill they will not have the choice of either taking the President's bill or have no bill at all. The only chance we have to defeat the President's bill, with all its discrimination and retaliatory moves against the South, is to adopt a better bill. We can protect the right of qualified citizens to vote and at the same time preserve the constitutional guarantees of the States to determine election laws and voter qualifications.

I have been working unceasingly for such an improved bill and the Republican Members of the House will offer one as a substitute for the President's bill. While the Republican bill still does not meet fully my original conception, it is a much better measure than the President's bill.

1. The Johnson bill applies to only a few States and only to a few counties in other States where there is a literacy test and less than half the adult population was registered or voted in the last election. The Republican bill applies to the Nation at large including every State and every county in every State where discrimination in registration and voting is being practiced.

2. The Johnson bill undertakes by statute rather than constitutional amendment to outlaw poll taxes in State and local elections. The Republican bill does not deal with poll taxes.

3. The Johnson bill authorized a State to win an exemption from coverage by proving that it had not practiced racial discrimination against a single individual a single time in the last 10 years. This is a reversal of the concept that the accused is presumed innocent until proven guilty. Since the Republican bill applies to all States, there is no need for such a provision.

4. The Johnson bill provided that, after the effective date of the bill, no State legislature could enact an enforceable change in its voting laws without first bringing a lawsuit for a declaratory judgment against the United States in the Federal court in the District of Columbia seeking prior approval. The Republican bill, recognizing that such a procedure violates the doctrine

September 8, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A5077

people who know they have a chair in the orchestra and they will not have to go away to be recognized. The audience knows this, too, because they are their parents and their friends. This is their orchestra. It's as simple as that.

VP file
Ike Makes It Clear: With L.B.J. on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 8, 1965

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the differences of opinion among some Members of this House about what we should or should not be doing in South Vietnam has been interpreted in certain quarters as a rupture in our bipartisan approach on foreign policy. The recent statement of support for the administration's position by former President Eisenhower did much to correct this impression. I commend it to your attention, Mr. Speaker, and to that of our colleagues:

IKE MAKES IT CLEAR: WITH L.B.J. ON VIETNAM

This week the Nation again had the pleasure of watching the Dwight D. Eisenhower crusade for peace in action. An impressive performance it was, for it left no doubt of where the former President stood. And what Ike did, it seems to us, was good for the Nation and for the Republican Party as well.

We have no doubt that President Johnson was grateful for the firm statements of support not only on Vietnam but also on the administration's decision to back down in the United Nations dues dispute. In fact, the anti-U.N. people, ready to pounce on Ambassador Goldberg's announcement in New York, were cut down by General Eisenhower almost before they had a chance to make their first move.

But the big development was on Vietnam. Until quite recently, the GOP has racked up a remarkable record of responsible support of the administration's foreign policy. In fact, the needling has come chiefly from some Democrats on Capitol Hill and from a fuzzy-thinking (and relatively small) segment of the population that just won't remember the lessons of Munich. Nevertheless, the ghost of Munich is walking again, and the former President, acutely conscious of the meaning of appeasement, stated the case for drawing a line in southeast Asia with exquisite clarity.

He also noted the need, in time of crisis, for presenting a united front to the world. Granted that there always will be certain dissenting noises in the background, it should be clear that the United States is united on its policy in southeast Asia. Here is the President, of one party, and a former President, of the other, speaking almost with one voice.

We would not attempt to sort out the confusion of statements this last week that prompted General Eisenhower to speak so candidly. On the one hand, there seemed to be a Republican attempt to show that there is a division between General Eisenhower and President Johnson. There was also the implication that someone was using the former President for political purposes.

All of which, it seems to us, added up to so much nonsense. And some Republican spokesman did not add much luster to the party's record of bipartisan support in foreign policy.

But indirectly, good may have come of it all. The former President felt that he had to say, once more, what he thought he had said quite plainly before. With Lyndon B. Johnson and with the vast majority of Americans, he stands for peace and freedom. In the case of South Vietnam, that means that the line must be drawn against aggressive communism and that, if the terrors of all-out war are to be avoided, there can be no retreat until peace and freedom are guaranteed for the Vietnamese people.

That is what Dwight Eisenhower said. Mr. Johnson should be grateful for this restatement by an elder statesman so widely respected here and abroad. The Nation should be grateful. And so, come to think of it, should the Republican Party.

Agricultural Labor in California—A
Realistic Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 8, 1965

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to publicly thank the Secretary of Labor for his certification last week of 9,500 additional Mexican workers to save the California tomato harvest from catastrophe. The workers were certified on the recommendation of the Secretary's California Farm Labor Panel who are to be commended on their efforts to remain continuously abreast of California's ever-changing agricultural labor problems.

California growers this year have stampeded to mechanize, to use women and children and athletic teams to harvest at wage rates which are the best in the Nation, higher than any contemplated minimum wage law and competitive with industrial wages in many parts of the country. Additionally, better than three-fourths million dollars is being paid by growers in a futile attempt to recruit farmworkers in other alleged pockets of surplus labor in other parts of the country.

Hank Tweith's Independent Herald of Yuba City, Calif., further puts this issue in perspective as follows:

THE QUALITY OF LABOR

The quality of mercy may drop gently from heaven but the quality of labor does not, and, if the mercy of growers in Sutter-Yuba isn't strained this season, their patience with the quality of their work crews has been tested mightily.

If this facet of the farm labor problem hasn't percolated through the thousands—more likely millions—of words that have been spoken and written on this year's labor crisis, it is only because the farmer and his spokesmen are not as articulate as they should be in presenting agriculture's case.

Over the years some of the most unpleasant words that have ever blotted paper have

been the accusations that farmers deliberately exploit their hired hands by depressing wages. This complaint is no more valid against growers than it is of any employer who is faced with the chore of using labor in production, sales, and service. To show a profit on operations, growers, like factory owners, automobile dealers, and hot dog stands must get marketable production from their work force.

This has been particularly true in California where farmers actually mass-produce fruits and vegetables—almost half of the total U.S. production—and they do so from a cornucopia of abundance that permitted in other days—when labor costs were low—considerable waste.

Yet, the California farmer has, for more than a generation, paid the biggest farm payroll in the Nation and maintained the second highest pay rate scale—exceeded only by Washington State where the hired labor pool is small and crop production small.

But in recent years as quality standards have stiffened and labor costs have climbed, economic survival has depended greatly upon the yield per acre a grower could achieve. High yield cannot be obtained with a labor force that is careless or casual or, in a true sense, unskilled.

This skill factor in farming is surrounded by misinformation concerning the degree of skill required from an adequate farmworker. The myth is exaggerated, of course, by the fact that the pertinent requirements are of a nature not marketable anywhere else but in agriculture such as the ability to work long hours under a hot sun in a dusty field with constant strain on muscles most of us don't even know we have.

It is no special criticism of men and women in the Nation's heaviest pockets of unemployment that they do not have, in this stage of an industrial-urban society, those skills. Some people cannot sew or cook and there are others who cannot handle the equations of stellar navigation.

When growers complain—ofttimes bitterly—that 200 workers reported to a field or orchard at 7 a.m. and that by 9 only a handful were still working, they may be inclined to comment—or at least find themselves as saying—the crews are “too lazy” to work. In calmer moments, most of them might agree that the labor available is frequently simply unable to perform the function of climbing trees or bending over hours at a time. Some people, it is reported, cannot write news stories, repair television sets, or play the piano.

Because wages in farming are based on production—as strangely enough they are in every nonpolitical activity and sometimes there—growers have used as much as they could, piece rate pay scales for their work force, paying some startlingly high paychecks under this system to some of their hired hands.

But piece rate scales are only a means of measurement and do not help a grower get a crop out of orchard or field when fruit or vegetables are at precisely the right stage of maturity. Too early or too late means an unmarketable harvest. Unskilled labor on any pay scale means damaged trees and vines and wasted efforts by other crop handlers.

When gang labor was the complete key to the California harvest with as many as 700,000 people working at peak seasons and in a time when there was more farm background in the Nation's populace than there is today, it was possible with a combination of skilled farmworkers and a large number of eager hands and strong bodies to deliver a satisfactory tonnage. Seven tons of peaches per acre or 10 tons of tomatoes

A5078

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 8, 1965

wasn't bad then although such growers go quickly bankrupt now. With relatively low yields, with lenient quality standards and with low wage rates, there was still a margin of profit for farm operators.

But as wage rates have risen—and they have been going up steadily for more than a decade—there has developed sharper labor management on farms and greater research into automation to eliminate the more arduous phase of farmwork—the hauling, the lifting, the bending—and to retain still the services of those who could stand the heat, the dirt and the monotony of farm harvests.

Some of sharp vision may have noticed the decline of winos on farm payrolls in recent years—a direct result of management recognition that a part-time worker at full-time pay hurts production and inflates payrolls.

Until this year in California, the Mexican bracero filled the gap where management and machines has not yet reached. For years, legally and illegally, he had been part of the California farm scene but in recent years he was a regulated "package" force, assigned almost exclusively to special crops, and his loss in the first 8 months of this year has affected harvests of lettuce, strawberries, cotton, sugarbeets, asparagus, dates, and tomatoes to varying degree depending not on substitute labor but on advancements in mechanization for each commodity. His background in a native agricultural society, where, for the most part, he worked in one form or another of husbandry or didn't work at all, made him ideal for the seasonal activity which creates almost all of the farm jobs in California. He was transported here under contract, did what was asked of him or was sent home and was available when needed.

He was no more "enslaved" than are the Beatles to make contracted appearances and his wages were the prevailing scale of the district where he worked—set by the Government, not the grower—and were very high in relation to what he could make in Mexico and substantial by any standard when he was truly skilled. As a matter of fact he was not "cheap" as a worker. Last year in the Sacramento Valley, the minimum bracero wage was \$1.25 an hour, the average was \$1.50 and ranged to \$2.50 and higher for some workers. In addition, the grower picked up a payroll charge for administration, transportation, insurance, room and board that added up to, at least, another \$1 an hour per man.

But the bracero did get the work done whereas his substitutes this year in the same fields, including football players, women, and other youngsters have not done so well no matter how willing. Too many growers this year have found themselves paying a minimum of \$1.40 an hour for a production with a cash value of \$1 or less. How many plumbing firms could afford to pay their artisans pipe and lug 40 percent more than their services would bring in the marketplace?

In the farm labor crisis of 1965, the most frustrating situation has been the bland statements by Government officials and labor union leaders that growers could get all the help they need if they would pay enough. Yet, how may physicists, concert musicians, topflight salesmen, competent executives and skilled administrators would they get—at any scale—with an ad in the morning newspaper? Somewhat more, we suspect, than the 14 tomato pickers located in one combing of Louisiana.

One of the requirements for learned utterances on the criteria for farm labor should be a week's work in a peach orchard or tomato field, or, even, the relatively soft job

of hoeing sugarbeets on a summer's afternoon in the Sacramento Valley.

These experts on labor might discover the farmer's problem is almost as simple as delivering a pound of flesh without a drop of blood.

Congressman Horton Welcomes March of Dimes Big City Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1965

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, On October 4 and 5, 1965, in Washington, the National Foundation, March of Dimes—will convene its most important meeting of the year. At that time, more than 500 top-level volunteer leaders, representing all 50 States and every major city, will plan the 1966 March of Dimes campaign against birth defects, one of the Nation's leading causes of premature death and disability.

The importance of their task cannot be overstated. Each year in the United States, an estimated 250,000 babies are born with significant birth defects. Sixty thousand children and adults and an estimated half million unborn babies die as a result of these defects. With the exception of heart disease, no other condition claims so many lives.

Some of the causes of these tragedies are known. The news media recently focused attention on the thousands of defective children being born to mothers infected with German measles during last year's epidemic. In most cases, however, neither causes nor means of prevention nor specific methods of treatment are known.

The National Foundation—March of Dimes, has made a strong beginning in the fight against these problems through its national network of treatment centers and an international program of scientific research. It is to map a program of expansion in this urgent campaign that these volunteers from across the country are meeting here in Washington.

The National Foundation—March of Dimes, since its establishment in 1938, has always believed that the way to solve a problem in America is to bring its importance home to the public. When the people are convinced that the job is important enough, they will do something about it. That is what happened in the fight against polio when the public, through the March of Dimes, achieved one of the most important medical victories of our time: the development of the Salk and Sabin vaccines.

The men and women attending this national conference will be truly representatives of the people of their States and communities, where they are laboring to bring about an awareness of the birth defects problem. They are the

chairmen of each State March of Dimes organization, the State chairmen of women's activities, and the chairmen of the largest of the foundation's 3,100 county chapters. Last year, they and their counterparts coordinated the work of an army of some 3 million volunteers, including a corps of nearly a million Marching Mothers who visited an estimated 10 million homes distributing educational materials and seeking financial support for the March of Dimes.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that a great part of America is involved in this massive struggle. I know that all the Members of this House join with me in welcoming these dedicated people to our Capital City and in wishing them every success as they plan the important work of attacking the scourge of birth defects.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 8, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include my weekly report to my constituents of April 22, 1965:

WASHINGTON REPORT FROM CONGRESSMAN JIM MARTIN, SEVENTH DISTRICT, ALABAMA

THE PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION RESOLUTION

The House passed House Joint Resolution 1, proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for presidential succession. The vote was 368 to 29 and I was one of the 29 voting against the resolution. This is one of those technical pieces of legislation not easy to explain, but I feel there is grave danger in approving an amendment to the Constitution which would make it possible for an appointed official, never having been approved by the people, to become President of the United States.

Under this proposal, upon the death of the President, the Vice President, having taken the oath as the new President, would appoint a new Vice President. His appointee would have to be approved by the Senate and House, but there are no restrictions as to whom he could appoint. I could not help but think whom the present Vice President, HUBERT HUMPHREY, might appoint if fate decreed that he became President. Certainly, his choice would be approved by the present liberal majority in the House and Senate. This worries me when I remember that on their first vote after having been sworn in as Members of the 89th Congress and having taken an oath to uphold the Constitution, 149 Members of this Congress voted not to seat the legally elected Members of Congress from the State of Mississippi. What could happen in the future, and what kind of man could be appointed as Vice President if some later Congress, made up of ultraliberal-radicals, decided to impose their choice on the people? It is too dangerous a power to confer lightly.

I believe we should follow the present order of succession which makes the Speaker of the House next in line for Vice President.